



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



BR

/ J875

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

EDITED BY
THE REV. HENRY BURGESS, LL.D., PH.D.,
MEMBER OF THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF LITERATURE.

VOL. VI.

LONDON :
ALEXANDER HEYLIN, PATERNOSTER ROW.
EDINBURGH : W. OLIPHANT AND SON. DUBLIN : S. B. OLDHAM.
1858.

LONDON:
PRINTED BY MITCHELL AND SON,
WARDOUR STREET, W.

INDEX

TO

VOLUME THE SIXTH.

A

- Acts of the Apostles, Alexander on, 443.
Adam Clarke, Dr., account of Early Life of, 500.
Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes, 171.
Analecta Nicæna, Syriac Gleanings by B. Harris Cowper, 209.
American Bible Union, on Thessalonians, 210.
Analytical Index to Gospels, by Dr. Stroud, 211.
Antiquities of the Holy Land, 228.
Artaxerxes Longimanus, Dr. Carl Auberlen on, 418.
Assyrian Inscriptions, proceedings of the Literary Inquest on, 203; Rev. G. V. Smith on, 204.

B

- Baalbec, supposed Scripture names of, 498.
Baptism of our Lord, its true date examined, 74.
Basques, the, researches on, 233.
Biblical Revision—the Gospel of St. John. A critical examination of the Version of five Clergymen, 1; proves a witness to the excellence of the Authorized Version, 64; works on revision, 210.
Bible Studies, by J. H. Titcomb, 479.

- Bibles printed, antique copies of, 225.
Bibliotheca Glottica, 501.
Beirut, intelligence from, 499.
Bengel's Gnomon of the New Testament, 465.
Bethlehem described, 277.
Birth of our Lord, its true date examined, 68.
Blomfield, Bishop, life of, 242; Library of, 501.
Bunsen, Chevalier, his proposed new German version of the Bible, 238.

C

- Christian Orthodoxy, by Dr. Donaldson, 191.
Christian Epoch, its date examined, 65.
Christianity and Hinduism, by Dr. Rowland Williams, 207.
Christian Art, on, 494.
Christian Jewish Sects in Russia, 497.
Christianity in accordance with the nature of man, 172.
Celtic Burial-places, 496.
Clemens Romanus and the Phoenix, 441.
Codex Vaticanus, Vercellone's Preface to Mai's edition of, 467.
Comte's Philosophy, 306.
Conybeare, Dean, life of, 243.
Correspondence, 161, 383.

Cousin, the founder of modern Eclecticism, 304.
 Cyclopædia, Bibliographica, by J. Darling, 214.
 Cozri, the, of Rabbi Yehudah Hallevi, 495.

D

Darius and Cyrus the Great, Mr. Bosanquet on, 163.
 Darius of Scripture, Rev. W. B. Saville on, 408.
 Davidson, Dr. S., on early corruptions of the Text of the New Testament by Christians, 266; defended in relation to his part in Horne's Introduction, 383.
 Dead Sea, the, 230.
 Dick, Dr., life of, 239.
 Descartes, his philosophy, 298.
 Deuteronomy, its genuineness as the production of Moses, 313; proved by direct quotations in the Old Testament, 315; by verbal allusions, 316; by historical traces, 317; by collateral arguments, 318; corroborated by our Lord, 323.

E

Egyptian Dynasties, No. III., 345.
 Egyptian Monuments in British Museum, 230.
 Egypt, political system of, under the Pharaohs, 231.
 Elohim, Jewish ideas of the name, 485.
 Emerson, bearing of his works on Pantheism, 307.
 Embalment of Edward I., 235.
 Encyclopædia Britannica, 481.
 English Bible, the general excellence of, 64; works on, 210.
 Errors, typographical, in theological works, 272.
 Essays on the accordance of Christianity with the nature of man, by E. Fry, 172.
 Ezra and Nehemiah, historical dates of, 482.

F

Feuerbach's development of German Pantheism, 304

G

Gathered Lilies, the, a work of art, 481.
 Glasgow Cathedral, painted windows of, 234.
 God's providential and moral government vindicated, 250; atheistic theory of, 251; objections to, 259.
 Golden Calf, the, remarks on, by Mr. Napier, 161.
 Guericke's Church History, 206.

H

Hebrews v. 7, remarks on, 403; ix. 16, 17, remarks on, 407.
 Hebrew Criticisms, by Mr. Keightley, 427.
 Hebrew Grammar, elements of, by Murphy, 477.
 Hegel, his philosophical system, 303.
 Herod, death of, its true date examined, 66.
 Holy Sepulchre, the site of, 140.

I

Image of God, the meaning of the term, 168.
 Intelligence, 215, 482.
 Isaiah, Dr. Henderson on, 208.
 Idealism, influence of Leibnitz on, 298.
 Isaiah, D. M. Dreschler on, 464.
 Israel of the Alps, the, a History of the Waldenses, by Muston, 479.

J

Japan, pagan sect in, 237.
 Jerusalem, present state of, 493.
 Jewish hatred of Christianity, 236.
 Jewish Sepulchres, 490.
 John the Baptist's Ministry, date of its commencement, 69.
 John the Baptist, his Mission and Character, 325; came in the fulness of time, 325; his relation to the Jews, 330; to Christ; 335; close and results of his mission, 340.
 Jonah, book of, Lectures on, by Rev. P. S. Desprez, 212.
 Jordan, the Plain of, 280.
 Joseph in Egypt, his influence in circulating divine knowledge, 355.

K

Kant, his philosophical system, 302.
Kings and Chronicles, commentaries on, by Keil and Bertheau, 475.

L

Lamech, his address to his wives, Gen. iv., 425.
Life in Israel, by Maria T. Richards, 212.

M

Magi, their visit to Nazareth or Bethlehem? 78.
Manual of Sacred History, by Rev. J. E. Riddle, 209.
Marriage and Divorce, scriptural law of, 215.
Melodies of the Jewish Spanish Liturgy, 470.
Michmash, described, 287.
Miracles of the Old Testament, how far attributable to natural causes, 131.
Modern Anglican Theology, by Rev. J. Rigg, 212.

N

Nativity, date of, 433.
New Testament translated: St. Matthew, by Rev. T. S. Green, 210.
New Works, lists of, Foreign, 245, 502; English, 246, 504.
Notices of Books, 172, 443.
Numbers, Book of, *Notæ Criticæ* on, by Professor Selwyn, 478; and *Deuteronomy*, translated from the *Septuagint*, by Dr. Howard, 478.

O

Obituary, 239.
Original Language, on the, 225.
Owen, Dr., his works, 501.

P

Palestine, sites of its sacred places, 124.

Pantheism, its historical phases, 294; allied to polytheism, 295; danger of it in the present day, 295; its antiquity, 296; modern, originated by Spinoza, 297; its God described, 308; danger of to social order, 310.
Paragraph Bible, Bagster's, 211.
Patristic Literature, labours of Abbe Migne on, 237.
Person of Christ, Dorner on the, 462.
Persian Jews, 500.
Peter, St., legend of his Penetential Food, 148.
Periods of our Lord's Life and Ministry, 65; doubts of the exact date of the Christian Epoch, 65.
Prayer, duty of, 231.
Prince of Peace, the, a work of art, 481.
Prophecies relating to Nineveh and Assyria, by G. V. Smith, 203.
Psalms, plain commentary on, 476.
Ptolemy, his asserted departures from the text of the New Testament, 267.

R

Rare Books, sale of, 227.
Romans, on the Epistle to, by Dr. Brown, 458; by Rev. A. C. Bromhead, 462.
Roman Catholic edition of the Scriptures, 500.

S

Sabbath, history of the, under the Old Testament, 83; its divine origin and universal obligation, 83; Prize Essay on, by Rev. Micaiah Hill, 210.
Sahara, the, 499.
Sivan the Sleeper, by Rev. H. C. Adams, 231.
Six Days of Creation, remarks, on, 487.
Sensational Philosophy of Locke, 299; developed in France, 300.
Sepulture, care of, by early Christians, 140; by ancient Jews, 141.
Smoking Flax, the, meaning of, 438.
Spinoza, the inventor of modern Pantheism, 297.
Stanley's Sinai and Palestine, strictures on, 117.
Syrian Sepulchres, Professor Stanley's theory of, 134.
Syriac Lexicon, by Bernstein, 474.

T

- Teaching of our Lord, how far suggested by local circumstances, 121.
 Tiglath Pileser I., inscription of, translated as a test of the knowledge of the Assyrian inscriptions, 203.
 Three Months in the Holy Land, 273.
 Tischendorf, his labours on behalf of Biblical Learning, 502.
 Tobit, book of, its inspiration maintained by the Church of Rome, 373; inconsistencies and absurdities of, 374.
 Trent, Council of, new history of, 234.

V

- Vita della beata Vergine Maria, 213.

- Voices from the Rocks, in reply to Hugh Miller, 478.
 Vowel Points, Dr. Wall on the interpolation of, 201.

W

- Waldenses, history of, by Muston, 479.
 Working Classes, letters to the, 480.
 Wordsworth's New Testament, 184, 455.

X

- Xenophon and Cyrus the Great, 170.

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XI.—OCTOBER, 1857.  
~~~~~

BIBLICAL REVISION.—The Gospel of St. John.

GREAT thanks are due to the five clergymen who have put forth the revised translation of the gospel according to St. John, to which we briefly called attention in a former number.^a The question, so freely mooted of late, as to the completeness and sufficiency of our Authorized Version, is thus met by a practical answer. We are enabled, thus far at least, to attach to that question its real weight and value. We may compare together the old and the new; and few perhaps will hesitate as to the conclusion, that the old is better.

Now this result, if we arrive at it, is attained to by a very safe and satisfactory course. We have a portion of Scripture most wisely chosen for the purpose of direct comparison. Those who have undertaken its re-translation are eminently qualified for the task. The principle upon which it has been carried out is simple and unexceptionable.

I. The gospel by St. John has been chosen with great wisdom. It is long enough to supply a fair and adequate test; and yet it lies within so small a compass that it may be very easily

^a *The Gospel according to St. John, after the Authorized Version.* Newly compared with the original Greek, and revised by five Clergymen:—John Barrow, D.D.; George Moberly, D.C.L.; Henry Alford, B.D.; William G. Humphrey, B.D.; Charles J. Ellicott, M.A. London: John W. Parker and Son. Royal 8vo, pp. 80. (April, 1857.)

tested. Moreover, the peculiarity of St. John's Greek would perhaps more readily induce erroneous translation; while his peculiar record of doctrinal and spiritual truth would so greatly enhance the vital consequence of any such error.

II. The very names of the five translators carry with them their own credentials. They are all of them, so to speak, masters in Israel. They are specially fitted by learning, and by previous experience in critical theology, for the execution of so grave a work. They are well known as men of deep and earnest religious principles; they are altogether unknown as partizans on either side of the conflicting opinions into which the religious world is now divided.

III. The principle on which the translation has been accomplished commends itself at once to every man's judgment. It gives us the result of individual and yet united effort; a separate and also a combined investigation; a quintuple guarantee for the same common labour. The correctness and fidelity of the Authorized Version is thus fully and strictly put to the proof; and we may congratulate ourselves that the issue has been joined. The alterations which have been proposed are, as we might expect, many and various. The majority of them arise from a closer attention to the force of particles, or tenses, and the more exact rendering of certain words; some of them exhibit statements of truth in a clearer and more intelligible form: not one of them, it may be confidently affirmed, throws doubt or question upon any essential truth, as already stated.

To suppose that the Authorized Version is incapable of any alteration for the better, would be to presuppose the gift of actual inspiration for the original translators. To find that it admits of scarcely more improvement than consists in greater amount of secular scholarship, and greater nicety of expression, springing out of the natural change and progress of language itself, this bespeaks for the original translators much soundness of knowledge, patient painstaking, sagacious faithfulness. To find that no vital truth of Scripture has been ignored, or overlaid, or erroneously set forth, this will confirm us in the sure conviction, how clearly the grace and providence of God guided the pen of those ready writers, went along with and watched over their labours, and guarded the Divine Word from all risk of marring by human adulteration.

The revisers have put forth their work as an experiment; not to provoke unkindly criticism, but purposely to invite fair and honest examination. With this view, and in this spirit, the revision is examined in the following pages; it has been followed out verse by verse, its variations noted down, and divided into

three several classes. One comprehends those passages which, either by greater accuracy, or clearer expression, or from any other cause, are manifestly improved. Another, those which vary in terms, but are not different in sense from the Authorized Version. A third, those which admit of debate and question, and therefore perhaps had better not have been suggested. For convenience sake, these have been marked respectively with the symbols +, =, — ; and thus at a glance the exact amount of needful change may be reckoned up in each chapter, and, from the aggregate of chapters, the whole gain upon this one gospel may be estimated clearly. To save space, and avoid repetition, it seemed sufficient that different alterations of the same kind should be noticed only once. In the end it will be found, that the great majority of desirable alterations consists in structure rather than in statement ; in phrase, but not in fact ; often in the clearness with which truth may be set forth, never in the reality of the truth itself. We shall perhaps be disposed to conclude that every needful requirement would be fully satisfied by a somewhat considerable addition to our present marginal readings. These, of course, should not be admitted merely at the suggestion of individual clergymen, however talented and trustworthy ; they must be adopted with the formal sanction of adequate ecclesiastical authority. The one great advantage of such a course would be, that it is no innovation. It is simply carrying out, to its requisite extent, the principle already acknowledged and acted upon in the Authorized Version. That Version will then remain intact and unmutated ; no violence will be done to the natural and religious feelings of Christian men ; no excuse or opportunity will be afforded for tampering with, or throwing the doubts of scorn upon that translation, which has been the rule of faith, the trusted guide to truth, the ground of heavenward hope for generations. This will still remain, and be accounted our all but perfect translation of the Word of God.

If the revisers of the gospel by St. John shall set forward a movement towards such a desirable end, they will have done no little service. Of old, as we read in Roman history, “*Quinqueviri muris turribusque reficiendis creati sunt.*” Their modern namesakes have entered upon the same office in a holier sense. They have been marking well that tower and bulwark of our Christian Zion, the pure and unveiled knowledge of the Word of Life. They have gone round about this tower with wary carefulness ; they have found it, not only beautiful and the joy of the whole earth, but needing nothing to give it soundness or stability or strength ; needing, it may be, somewhat of surface

cementing and outward adornment, here a little and there a little; but firm in its rock foundation, indestructible in its fabric, and reaching up to heaven in its height.

Having so laboured, but not in vain, they will tell those who may come after them in any kindred labour, that it will not be wise or safe to lay hands suddenly upon this hallowed building. As with God's altar in the early day, they must beware of lifting up their tool upon it, lest they pollute it; lest they break down its walls, desiring to build them up; lest they undermine instead of strengthening its foundations; lest they daub with untempered mortar the structure that has been raised with judgment laid to the line and righteousness to the plummet. Undoubtedly, if any one shall so attempt to fasten crude and fancied emendations upon our English Bible, he will reverse against himself the imperial boast; and reasonable, thinking men will say of him, "Marmoream invenit, lateritiam reliquit."

In the following examination of the revision of St. John, the writer can at least lay claim to the credit of having carefully considered the proposed amendments, and he lays them before the public in the hope that the cause of scriptural truth may be promoted. The Authorized Version is first given, and the alterations follow with an R prefixed to them. The Greek text used is Bloomfield's.

CHAPTER I.

Ver. 3. Πάντα δι' αὐτῆς ἐγένετο. καὶ χωρὶς αὐτῆς ἑδὲ ἐν ἐγένετο ὃ γέγονεν.—ὃ γέγονεν. *That was made.* R. *That hath been made.* This change is doubtless proposed to mark the difference of tense—ἐγένετο and γέγονεν. But is it quite safe to make γέγονεν such a decided perfect? This would hardly be borne out by the two exceptional instances from Plat. *Alcib.*, i., adduced by Buttman (*Irreg. Verbs*). The ordinary sense of γέγονα is all but a present. Here ὃ γέγονεν might almost be rendered, *that hath existence*. So Heb. xi. 3, γεγονέναι would be more strongly expressed *are*, than *were* made, though the perfect κατηρτίσθαι goes before. "By faith we understand that the worlds have been framed by the word of God, so that the things seen *are* not formed, that is, *do* not exist, from the things which appear." St. John affirms the doctrine which St. Paul, with his better knowledge of purer Greek, sets forth to the Colossians (i. 16, 17): ἐν αὐτῷ ἐκτίσθη τὰ πάντα . . . καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκε; where συνέστηκε, like γέγονεν, is a past present, and so is rightly rendered *consist*. Again, if any

alteration were to be made in the translation of this verse, it would have been better to have marked the force of ἐδὲ ἐν—not even one thing. —

Ver. 5. ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ.—*In darkness.* R. *In the darkness*, as it certainly should be. +

Ver. 8. *Was sent.* R. *Came*, borrowing ἦλθεν from ver. 7 more naturally, than ἀπεσταλμένος from ver. 6. +

Ver. 8. τὸ φῶς.—*That light.* R. *The light*, as before. +

Ver. 9. ὃ φωτίζει.—*Which lighteth.* R. *Which lighteneth*, scarcely needed. =

Ver. 9. ἐρχόμενον.—*That cometh.* R. *Coming.* This version is adopted as a sort of compromise, and is therefore vague and unsatisfactory. From the preface (p. xiii) it would seem that preference is rather given to ἐρχόμενον as masculine. But surely Scholefield (*Hints*, p. 40) is right in saying that this would require τὸν ἐρχόμενον. If altered, it should rather stand, *Which at its coming into the world enlighteneth every man.* —

Ver. 11. εἰς τὰ ἴδια ἦλθε, καὶ οἱ ἴδιοι αὐτὸν ἔπαρέλαβον.—*He came unto his own, and his own received him not.* R. *He came unto his own, and his own people received him not.* The adjectives standing alone in the original, the translators have consistently omitted the substantives in each case. The revision omits one, and introduces the other, with an apologetic misgiving (pref., p. xiii), that “they would fain have expressed the neuter τὰ ἴδια.” But why one without the other? If any change were desired, by supplying ἔθνη to the former, as λαοὶ in the latter, it might have been rendered, *He came to his own country, and his own countrymen received him not.* But how much simpler and more forcible it stands unaltered. —

Ver. 14. δόξαν ὡς μονογενῆς παρὰ πατρὸς.—*The glory as of the only-begotten of the Father.* R. *Glory as of the only-begotten from the Father.* If altered at all, should it not be, “*A glory as of an only-begotten of a father?*” That is, an indefinite sentence with a definite application. —

Ver. 15. ὁ ὀπίσω μου ἐρχόμενος ἔμπροσθέν μου γέγονεν ὅτι πρῶτός μου ἦν.—*He that cometh after me is preferred before me; for he was before me.* R. *He that cometh after me is advanced before me; because he was before me.* To render γέγονεν is *advanced* seems very violent; for it also somewhat of an apology is given in the preface (p. xiv): it is adopted to avoid a misunderstanding of *preferred*, into which it is clear Johnson has fallen. The parallel passage from Milton given by Johnson explains his view:—

“O Spirit, that dost *prefer*
Before all temples th’ upright heart.”

Cf. Plat. *Phædr.*, 245, ὡς πρὸ τῆ κεκινημένῃ τὸν σῶφρονα δεῖ προαιρεῖσθαι φίλον. At any rate, if Johnson be in error, we may go to Bishop Pearson, who says (p. 110, fol.) with reference to St. John in this verse, "First, he taketh to himself a priority of time, speaking of Christ, *He that cometh after me*; secondly, he attributeth unto Christ a priority of dignity, saying, *He is preferred before me*." But, after all, the question is not, whether *advanced* is an improvement upon *preferred*, but whether either of them really expresses the original Greek. Clearly ὀπίσω μὲ and ἔμπροσθέν μὲ are antithetical, as are ἐρχόμενος and γέγονεν. If ὀπίσω is a temporal adverb, so is ἔμπροσθεν; one can scarcely be of time and the other of place. There must also be a strict analogy between ἐρχόμενος and γέγονεν; namely, that of the Saviour's existence, and his coming into the world: while the same fact, to give it greater significance, is repeated by ὅτι πρῶτός μὲ ἦν. The testimony of the Baptist is simply this, that the Saviour must have priority, because he had pre-existence: *He that cometh after me, hath existence before me; inasmuch as he was before me*. Even as to πρῶτος, it may be said, not merely that it is for πρότερος, but that it carries with it latently its superlative sense; it involves the truth αὐτός ἐστι πρὸ πάντων (Col. i. 17).

Ver. 16. ἐκ τῆ πληρώματος αὐτοῦ.—*Of his fulness*. R. *Out of his fulness*, gives the proper force of ἐκ, implying that we not only partake in the fulness of Christ, but derive ours from him. +

Ver. 17. διὰ Μ . . . διὰ Χρ.—*By*. R. *Through*. See pref., p. xiii. Is anything gained by the change? ^{The proper sense of διὰ with the genitive is from}

Ver. 18. ἐξηγήσατο.—*Hath declared*. R. *Declared*, as marking the aor. from the perfect, but the sense is nowise altered. +

Ver. 19. ἡ μαρτυρία.—*The record*. R. *The testimony*. +

Ver. 32. ἐμαρτύρησεν.—*Bare record*. R. *Bare witness*. +

Ver. 38. μένεις.—*Dwellest*. R. *Abidest*, which is the marginal reading. =

Ver. 39. εἶδον πῶς μένει καὶ παρ' αὐτῷ ἔμειναν.—*Saw where he dwelt, and abode with him*. R. *Saw where he abode, and remained with him*. Nothing is gained by this change; it would have been better to give the same meaning, *abide*, to μένειν, in the three places. —

Ver. 42. ἐμβλέψας δὲ αὐτῷ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εἶπε.—*When Jesus beheld him, he said*. R. *Jesus looked on him, and said*. If altered at all, surely it should be, *Jesus, after looking upon him, said*. —

Ver. 42. ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται Πέτρος.—*Which is by interpretation, a stone*. R. *Which is by interpretation, Peter*. This is the marginal reading. In Matt. xvi. 18, the Authorized Version gives, *Thou art Peter, and upon this rock will I build my church*. But

it may be doubted whether there also it had not better be *stone*, otherwise the distinction in the original is lost sight of, σὺ εἶ Πέτρος, καὶ ἐπὶ ταύτῃ τῇ Πέτρᾳ οἶκ. Cf. Wordsworth, *Theoph. Anglican*, pp. 188, 189, who cites the first notice of this distinction by Elmsley, *Æd. Col.* 1590. —

Ver. 43. ἠθέλησεν ἐξελθεῖν.—*Would go.* R. *Was minded to go.* *αυτοῦ ἀν ἀνελθῆναι* †

Ver. 44. ἀπὸ Βηθσ. ἐκ τῆς πόλεως.—*Philip was of Bethsaida, the city of Andrew and Peter.* R. *Philip was from Bethsaida, of the city of Andrew and Peter.* Which marks better the ἀπὸ and ἐκ. +

Ver. 45. Ἰησοῦν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Ἰωσήφ τὸν ἀπὸ Ναζαρέθ.—*Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.* R. *Jesus, the son of Joseph, which is from Nazareth,* which gives the same sense more correctly. +

Ver. 46. ἐκ Ναζαρέτ δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι.—*Can there any good thing come out of Nazareth?* R. *Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?* which makes little or no difference, except it be to weaken the force of the question, δύναται τι ἀγαθὸν εἶναι; *is any good thing capable of being?* Cf. *Herod.* ix. 45, τὰ σφάγια οὐ δύναται καταθύμια γενέσθαι. †

Ver. 51. ἀπ' ἄρτι.—*Hereafter.* R. *From henceforth,* which is also Scholefield's rendering. +

CHAPTER II.

Ver 2. ἐκλήθη δὲ καὶ ὁ Ἰ. καὶ οἱ μαθ.—*And both Jesus was called, and his disciples.* R. *And Jesus also was bidden, and his disciples.* Nothing seems gained by this, except that *bidden* may be more expressive than *called*, and is so used *Matt.* xxii. But δὲ is the connecting particle, joining ἐκλήθη to the former verse, and καὶ ὁ Ἰ. καὶ οἱ μαθ., couple together. +

Ver. 3. ὑστερήσαντος οἴνου.—*When they wanted wine.* R. *When the wine failed,* which is clearly the meaning of the words. Cf. *Plat. Leg.* 844, B. ἐλλείπει τῶν ἀναγκαίων πωμάτων. +

Ver. 8. ἀρχιτρικλίνῳ.—*Governor of the feast.* R. *Ruler of the feast,* uniformly as ver. 9. +

Ver. 9. οἱ ἡντληκότες.—*Which drew.* R. *Which had drawn.* +

Ver. 10. πρῶτον τὸν καλὸν οἶνον τίθησι, καὶ ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι, τότε τὸν ἐλάσσῳ.—*Every man at the beginning doth set forth good wine, and when men have well drunk, then that which is worse.* R. *Every man setteth on the good wine first; and when men have freely drunk, then that which is worse.* Τίθησι—ponit, h. s. to set on table; πρῶτον—at first. "Ὅταν μεθυσθῶσι should it not rather be, *When they become drunken, or filled*

with wine, then the inferior? Is the common opinion correct, that only free drinking, and not excess or drunkenness, is intended by μεθ.? Parkhurst maintains this from three places in the LXX. But 1 Kings xvi. 9, we have πίνων μεθύων—*drinking himself drunk*, A. V. And so 1 Cor. xi. 21, μεθύει—is *drunken*. The ordinary meaning in classical writers is certainly the gross one. Herodotus, i., 133, is quoted as an instance of free, but not excessive drinking; but is it so? There the Persians are spoken of, exactly as the Germans in *Tac. Germ.*, xxii., μεθυσκόμενοι δέ ἐώθασι βελεύεσθαι. κ τ. λ., but this μεθ. is opposed to νήφεισι afterwards; and in Tacitus the Germans are termed *vinolenti*. At the marriage-feast, μεθ. would seem of necessity to imply more than rational drinking, or they would have been able to distinguish the inferior from the good wine. —

Ver. 11. ταύτην ἐποίησε τὴν ἀρχὴν τῶν σημείων ὁ Ἰ.—*This beginning of miracles did Jesus*. R. *This beginning of his miracles did Jesus*, correctly marking τῶν, but missing τὴν. If altered, it should be, *This the beginning of his miracles did Jesus*. †

Ver. 11. ἐφάνερωσε . . . ἐπίστευσαν εἰς.—*Manifested forth—believed on*. R. *Manifested—believed in* (pref., p. xi.). = †

Ver. 12. ἐκεῖ ἔμειναν.—*They continued there*. R. *There they continued*. This, as the last, is perfectly immaterial. =

Ver. 15. καὶ ποιήσας φραγέλλιον ἐκ σχοινίων, πάντα ἐξέβαλεν ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ, τὰ τε πρόβατα καὶ τὰς βόας καὶ τῶν κολλυβιστῶν ἐξέχεε τὸ κέρμα, καὶ τὰς τραπέζας ἀνέστρεψε.—*And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove them all out of the temple, and the sheep, and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew the tables*. R. *And when he had made a scourge of small cords, he drove all out of the temple, both the sheep and the oxen; and poured out the changers' money, and overthrew their tables*. Strictly speaking, φραγ. ἐκ σχοιν. would be, not a scourge of small cords, but a little scourge of ropes; φραγ is, of course, merely from the Latin *flagellum*, which is a diminutive from *flagrum*. But σχοιν. is not in sense, though it is in form, a diminutive at all. For instance, in the only other place in N. T., Acts xxvii. 32, it is used for the ropes of the boat. Its use is the same in Her. i., v., 26, 85; in both places for ropes attached to the temple. Again, the R. seems to make προβ. καὶ βόας the apposition to πάντα, which really refers to κερματιστάς (ver. 14). Nor is it quite clear that τὰς τρ. means *their* tables; *the* tables, that is, the money-tables, yields equally good sense. —

Ver. 16. καὶ τοῖς τὰς περισσότερας πωλῶσιν εἶπεν.—*And said*

unto them that sold doves. R. And to them that sold the doves, he said. Why not mark the present participle, And to those who were selling the doves, he said? —

Ver. 16. ἐμπορίῳ.—*Merchandise*. R. *Merchandise*. But this would be ἐμπορίων, in the plural; in the singular, it means *mart*. —

Ver. 17. γεγραμμένον ἐστίν.—*It was written*. R. *It is written*. The completed action still present. +

Ver. 17. κατέφαγε—al. καταφάγεται.—*Hath eaten me up*. R. *Shall eat me up*. A mere question of text. =

Ver. 18. οὖν.—*Then*. R. *Therefore*. The former might be mistaken for a temporal particle. +

Ver. 20. ἐγερῆς.—*Rear*. R. *Raise*; properly retaining the same word as ver. 19. +

Ver. 24. αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Ι. οὐκ ἐπίστευεν ἑαυτὸν αὐτοῖς, διὰ τὸ αὐτὸν γινώσκειν πάντας.—*But Jesus did not commit himself unto them, because he knew all men*. R. *Yet Jesus did not trust himself to them, for that he knew all men*. There seems no reason for the stronger *yet* instead of *but*, for δὲ; and why is αὐτὸς ignored? *Jesus himself*. —

Ver. 25. αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐγίνωσκε.—*For he knew*. R. *For of himself he knew*; here the αὐτὸς is, as in the former verse, emphatic. But why not rendered, as in ver. 6, *For he himself knew*? —

CHAPTER III.

Ver. 3. ἄνωθεν.—*Again*. R. *Anew*. Which amounts to the same thing. Cf. Gal. iv. 9, πάλιν ἄνωθεν, combined together. =

Ver. 8. ἀλλ' οὐκ οἶδας.—*But canst not tell*. R. *But knowest not*. +

Ver. 10. ὁ διδάσκαλος.—*A master*. R. *The teacher*, according to Bishop Middleton's certain correction. +

Ver. 18. ὃ κρίνεται . . . ἤδη κέκριται.—*Is not condemned . . . is condemned already*. R. *Cometh not into judgment* (with a marginal—Gr. *is not being judged*). . . *is judged already*. Should not κρίνεται be rendered, *Is not brought under judgment*, as Acts xxiii. 6, περὶ ἐλπίδος καὶ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν ἐγὼ κρίνομαι? So Thuc., iii. 57, θανάτῳ κρίνεσθαι, to be tried for his life. While ἤδη κέκριται has been already judged, and so, is already condemned, πιστεύων—κρίνεται, and κέκριται—πεπίστευκεν, correspond. —

Ver. 19. κρίσις.—*Condemnation*. R. *Judgment*. Only preferable if κέκριται, ver. 18, be rendered *judged*. =

Ver. 19. ἣν γὰρ πονηρὰ αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα.—*Because their deeds were evil*. R. *For their works were evil*. The latter seems to

express no more than that evil-doing men love darkness rather than light; whereas the former (if γὰρ will bear the *because*), expresses the truth more clearly, that the evil-doing of men is the reason why they love darkness rather than light. —

Ver. 21. ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.—*He that doeth truth.* R. *He that doeth the truth.* The article need hardly be expressed. Rom. iii. 12, ποιῶν χρηστότητα, means much the same, though there is no article. Compare ver. 20, ὁ φαῦλα πράσσων with ch. v. 29, οἱ δὲ τὰ φαῦλα πράξαντες. —

Ver. 24. οὐπω γὰρ ἦν βεβλημένος.—*Was not yet cast.* R. *Was not yet cast.* (?) Had not yet been cast. —

Ver. 25. ἐγένετο οὖν ζήτησις ἐκ τῶν μαθητῶν Ἰωάννης μετὰ Ἰσδαίς (Steph. Ἰσδαίων) περὶ καθαρισμοῦ.—*Then there arose a question between some of John's disciples and the Jews about purifying.* R. *Then there arose a question on the part of John's disciples and a Jew about purifying.* This true rendering of ἐκ is also suggested by Scholefield. The singular, Ἰσδαίς, is surely the true reading. +

Ver. 26. ᾧ σὺ μεμαρτύρηκας.—*To whom thou bearest witness.* R. *To whom thou hast borne witness.* +

Ver. 27. ἐὰν μὴ ᾗ δεδομένον αὐτῷ.—*Except it be given him.* R. *Except it have been given him.* +

Ver. 31. ἐκ τῆς γῆς ἐστὶ.—*Is earthly.* R. *Is of the earth,* correctly retaining the same words in the English as in the Greek. So 1 Cor. xv. 47, the words are different, ὁ πρῶτος ἄνθρωπος ἐκ γῆς χοϊκός. +

Ver. 33. ἐσφράγισεν.—*Hath set to his seal.* R. *Hath set his seal.* Hardly worth alteration. =

34. ἔ γὰρ ἐκ μέτρου δίδωσιν ὁ Θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα.—*For God giveth not the spirit by measure unto him.* R. *For God giveth not the spirit by measure.* The addition *unto him* is unnecessary; but the italics of the A. V. shew that it is not in the original. The expression ἐκ μέτρου, almost reminds us of Eurip. Bacch. 209, ὁ Θεὸς . . . δι' ἀριθμῶν εἶδεν αὐξεσθαι θέλει. +

CHAPTER IV.

Ver. 1. ποιεῖ καὶ βαπτίζει.—*Made and baptized.* R. *Made and baptizeth.* Should it not be, *Maketh and baptizeth*, both for the stronger present sense, and in accordance with similar changes made in R.? e. g., ver. 17. —

Ver. 2. καὶ τοι γε.—*Though.* R. *And yet.* Which is καὶ τοι—and yet indeed, as these particles might equally be rendered, Acts xiv. 17; xvii. 27, where alone they occur again. —

Ver. 5. ἔρχεται εἰς πόλιν τῆς Σαμαρείας λεγομένην Συχάρ.

—Then cometh he to a city of Samaria, which is called Sychar. R. So he cometh to a city of Samaria, called Sychar. Neither change is of any moment; ἔν, so, marks perhaps better that it was the consequence of ἔδει (ver. 4), and the omission of *which* marks that it was the city, and not Samaria, that was called Sychar. But who could fall into that mistake? =

Ver. 6. ἐκαθέζετο ἔτως.—*Sat thus.* R. *Was sitting thus.* It is the imperfect. But why was ἔτως left *thus*, from which scarcely any meaning can be gathered? ἔτως=ῥαδίως. Cf. Elmsl. and Pflughk. *Eur. Heracl.*, 375. In the same sense, *Hor. Od.*, ii., 11, 14, *jacentes sic temere.* —

Ver. 9. ἡ γυνὴ ἡ Σαμαρεῖτις.—*The woman of Samaria.* R. *The Samaritan woman.* More correctly, as the Greek is changed from γυνὴ ἐκ τῆς Σαμαρείας, ver. 7. +

Ver. 9. ἐ γάρ συγχρῶνται Ἰουδαῖοι Σαμαρεῖταις.—*For the Jews have no dealings with the Samaritans.* R. *For Jews have no dealings with Samaritans.* More correct and more expressive without the articles. But is it well to leave συγχρῶνται—*have no dealings with?* Ver. 8, proves that they had dealings of traffic. Does not the word, which is not used again, rather mean here, *Do not associate with*, that is, in friendly offices? —

Ver. 11. οὔτε ἀντλημα ἔχεις, καὶ τὸ φρέαρ ἐστὶ βαθύ.—*Thou hast nothing to draw with, and the well is deep.* R. *Has left this unaltered.* Did the translators read οὐ τι ἀντλημα? At all events, the unusual οὔτε . . . καὶ is left unexpressed in R. —

Ver. 13. πᾶς ὁ πίνων.—*Whosoever drinketh.* R. *Every one that drinketh*, which correctly distinguishes it from ὅς δ' ἄν, ver. 14. +

Ver. 14. γενήσεται ἐν αὐτῷ.—*Shall be in him.* R. *Shall become in him.* +

Ver. 17. λέγει.—*Said.* R. *Saith.* Cf. ver. 1. +

Ver. 18. καὶ νῦν ὃν ἔχεις οὐκ ἔστι σε ἀνὴρ.—*And he whom thou now hast is not thy husband.* R. *And now he whom thou hast is not thy husband*; needed only if the (,) be put after νῦν. =

Ver. 21. ἔρχεται ὥρα.—*The hour cometh.* R. *An hour cometh.* Rather, *an hour is coming.* In this verse προσκυνήσετε is in R. better placed at the last—*Ye shall worship the Father.* +

Ver. 22. ὑμεῖς προσκυνεῖτε δὲ ἐκ οἴδατε ἡμεῖς προσκυνῶμεν δὲ οἴδαμεν ὅτι ἡ σωτηρία ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐστίν.—*Ye worship ye know not what; we know what we worship; for salvation is of the Jews.* R. *Ye worship that which ye know not; we worship that which we know; because salvation is of the Jews.* More clearly expresses the force of the original, except that *of the Jews* hardly gives ἐκ, which implies the source. +

Ver. 23. καὶ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ τοιότους ζητεῖ τὰς προσκυνῶντας αὐτόν.—*For the Father seeketh such to worship him.* R. *For such the Father also seeketh as his worshippers*; this is surely an improvement upon the A. V., which would require προσκυνήσοντας, and also upon the rendering suggested in the preface, p. xv, which involves a needless ellipsis of εἶναι. +

Ver. 27. ἐθαύμασαν ὅτι μετὰ γυναικὸς ἐλάλει.—*Marvelled that he talked with the woman.* R. *Marvelled that he was talking with a woman.* To mark the imperfect, ἐλάλει is of course correct; but B. Middleton, p. 333, has shewn that the absence of the article proves nothing, because of μετὰ; and that the probability rather inclines to the particular woman. —

Ver. 29. μήτι ἔτός ἐστιν ὁ Χριστός.—*Is not this the Christ?* R. *Can this be the Christ?* So Scholefield omits *not*, comparing ver. 33, μή τις ἤνεγκεν; and contrasting vii. 25, ἐχ' ἔτός ἐστιν; but he more simply renders—*Is this the Christ?* It may be doubted too, whether, in this instance, the rule of the grammarians holds good, that μή, so used in direct interrogations, expects a negative answer. The woman of Samaria was “almost persuaded to be a Christian.” +

Ver. 30. ἐξῆλθον καὶ ἤρχοντο.—*They went out and came.* R. *They went out and were coming.* +

Ver. 34. ἵνα ποιῶ καὶ τελειώσω.—*To do and to finish.* R. *To be doing and to finish.* Rightly marking the change from pres. subj. to aor. subj., but the sense remains the same. =

Ver. 35. ὅτι λευκαί εἰσι πρὸς θερισμὸν ἤδη.—*For they are white already for harvest.* R. *That they are white to harvest already.* +

Ver. 36. ἵνα καὶ ὁ σπείρων ὁμῶς χαίρῃ, καὶ ὁ θερίζων.—*That both he that soweth and he that reapeth may rejoice together.* R. *That both the sower and the reaper may rejoice together.* What is gained in neatness is lost in strength of expression. =

Ver. 37. ἐν γὰρ τῷ λόγῳ ἐστὶν ὁ ἀληθινός.—*For herein is that saying true.* R. *For herein is (fulfilled) that true saying.* Why not, with B. Middleton, *In this is exemplified the true saying?* Since this is adduced as an instance of the proverbial saying, *exemplified* suits better than *fulfilled*. At any rate it is well that the other rendering, half advocated from the German critics, pref. xv, was not adopted. —

Ver. 38. κεκοπιάκατε κεκοπιάκασι.—*Ye bestowed no labour laboured.* R. *Ye have bestowed no labour have laboured.* But the same English word might have been given for the same Greek word in both cases. —

Ver. 40. μέναι ἔμεινεν.—*That he would tarry he*

abode. R. *To tarry . . . he tarried.* Here the same word is given for both; *to remain* perhaps would have been as well. +

Ver. 41. καὶ πολλῶ πλείους ἐπίστευσαν διὰ τὸν λόγον αὐτῆ.—*And many more believed because of his own word.* R. *And many more believed because of his word.* Right as to αὐτῆ, but π. πλ. = *far more.* +

Ver. 42. ὁτος ἐστὶν ἀληθῶς ὁ σωτὴρ τοῦ κόσμου, ὁ Χριστός.—*This is indeed the Christ, the Saviour of the world.* R. *This is indeed the Saviour of the world, even the Christ.* Preserves the proper order of the sentence; but why the unnecessary addition of *even*? *The Christ* by itself is more strongly in apposition to *the Saviour of the world.* —

Ver. 43. μετὰ δὲ τὰς δύο ἡμέρας.—*Now after two days.* R. *Now after the two days,* sc. those mentioned ver. 40. +

Ver. 45. ὅτε οὖν ἦλθεν.—*Then when he was come.* R. *Then when he came.* Should not οὖν here be *therefore*? that is, in confirmation of what our Lord had said, ver. 44. —

Ver. 47. ὅτος, ἀκέσας.—*When he heard.* R. *The same when he heard.* (?) This man upon hearing. —

Ver. 47. ἵνα καταβῇ.—*That he would come down.* R. *To come down.* =

Ver. 50. εἶπεν.—*Had spoken.* R. *Spake.* +

Ver. 51. ἀπήγγειλαν.—*Told him.* R. *Brought tidings.* =

Ver. 52. ὥραν ἐβδόμην.—*At the seventh hour.* R. *In the seventh hour.* The accusative marking the course, rather than the point of time. +

Ver. 53. ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ὥρᾳ.—*At the same hour.* R. *In that hour.* Almost *in that very hour.* =

CHAPTER V.

Ver. 1. μετὰ ταῦτα.—*After this.* R. *After these things.* +

Ver. 2. ἐπὶ τῇ προβατικῇ.—*By the sheep market* (marg., *gate*). R. *By the sheep gate,* which is clear from Neh. i. 3. +

Ver. 3. τῶν ἀσθενούντων.—*Of impotent folk.* R. *Of the sick.* =

Ver. 4. ὁ οὖν πρῶτος ἐμβὰς μετὰ.—*Whosoever then first after thee.* R. *He therefore who first went in after.* Rather, *the first therefore that went in after.* —

Ver. 4. ὑγιῆς ἐγένετο, ᾧ δήποτε κατέχετο νοσήματι.—*Was made whole of whatsoever disease he had.* R. *Was made whole, with whatsoever disease he was afflicted.* +

Ver. 5. τριάκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ ἔτη ἔχων ἐν τῇ ἀσθενείᾳ.—*Which had an infirmity thirty and eight years.* R. *Which had been thirty and eight years in his infirmity.* Ἐχ. ἐν τῇ ἀσθ. is simply

ἀσθενῶν. Cf. Jelf. Gr., 360. Eur. Suppl., 176, ἐν μὲν αἰσχύναις ἔχω.

Ver. 6. ἰδὼν . . . κατακείμενον.—*When Jesus saw him lie.*
R. *Lying.* +

Ver. 6. θέλεις ὑγιῆς γενέσθαι.—*Wilt thou be made whole.*
R. *Desirest thou to be made whole.* The wilt thou=willest thou, could scarcely be mistaken. =

Ver. 7. ὅταν παραχθῇ τὸ ὕδωρ.—*When the water is troubled.*
R. *When the water hath been troubled.* +

Ver. 9. ἦν δὲ σάββατον ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ.—*And on the same day was the sabbath.* R. *Now on that day was the sabbath.*
Literally, It was holy rest on that day. =

Ver. 10. ἄραι τὸν κράββατον.—*To carry thy bed.* R. *To take up thy bed,* as in the two next verses. +

Ver. 13. ἐξένευσεν.—*Had conveyed himself away.* R. *Had withdrawn himself.* This alters without greatly improving upon the translation. Nearly, perhaps, ἐξένευσεν=passed away. —

Ver. 14. χεῖρόν τί σοι γένηται.—*A worse thing come unto thee.* R. *Some worse thing befall thee.* If changed (?) something worse happen to thee. —

Ver. 16. διὰ τῆτο . . . ἐποίησεν.—*Therefore . . . had done.*
R. *For this cause . . . did.* +

Ver. 18. ὅτι οὐ μόνον ἔλυε τὸ σάββατον, ἀλλὰ καὶ πατέρα ἴδιον ἔλεγε τὸν Θεόν, ἴσον ἑαυτὸν ποιῶν τῷ Θεῷ.—*Because he not only had broken the sabbath, but said also that God was his Father, making himself equal with God.* R. *Because he not only broke the sabbath, but also called God his own Father, making himself equal with God.* This is, perhaps, the most important correction that we have yet had. The A. V. not only is inaccurate in the tenses of the verbs, but altogether omits ἴδιον upon which, in fact, the whole meaning of the verse hinges. +

Ver. 19. ἐὰν μή τι βλέπη τὸν Πατέρα ποιῶντα.—*But what he seeth the Father do.* R. *Save what he seeth the Father doing.* +

Ver. 19. ὁμοίως.—*Likewise.* R. *In like manner.* Lest the former be mistaken for also, as Matt. xxi. 24. +

Ver. 20.—καὶ μείζονα τέτων δείξει αὐτῷ ἔργα.—*And he will shew him greater works than these.* R. *And greater works than these will he shew him.* The order and force of the words better preserved. +

Ver. 21. ἔγω καὶ ὁ Υἱός.—*Even so the Son.* R. *Even so the Son also.* (?) Thus also the Son. —

Ver. 22. ἐδὲ γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ κρίνει ἐδένα, ἀλλὰ τὴν κρίσιν πᾶσαν δέδωκε τῷ Υἱῷ.—*For the Father judgeth no man, but hath committed all judgment unto the Son.* R. *For neither doth the Father judge any man, but hath committed judgment altogether*

unto the Son. But it is οὐδὲ, not οὔτε. For not even doth the Father judge any man, but hath committed the judgment entirely to the Son; τὴν κρίσιν, the future judgment, (Cf. Matt. xii. 36,) since even the Son says of himself on earth, ἐγὼ ἡ κρίσις οὐδένα, viii. 15.

Ver. 23. ἵνα πάντες τιμῶσι.—*That all men should honour.* R. *That all may honour.* +

Ver. 23. τὸν πέμψαντα.—*Which hath sent.* R. *Which sent.* +

Ver. 24. εἰς κρίσιν οὐκ ἔρχεται, ἀλλὰ μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ.—*Shall not come into condemnation, but is passed from.* R. *Cometh not into judgment, but hath passed out of.* Ἐρχ. is clearly to be rendered as a present, but though κρίσις, ver. 22, is the judgment, here it must mean the condemnation of that judgment, so ver. 29, ἀνάστασιν κρίσεως, and Mark iii. 29, ἔνοχός ἐστιν αἰωνίου κρίσεως.

Ver. 27. ὅτι Υἱὸς ἀνθρώπου ἐστίν.—*Because he is the Son of Man.* R. wisely retains this. Those who are disposed to corrupt it into a son of man, may be convinced of their error by B. Middleton's note in l. There would be no difference of meaning if the rendering were—*Because he is Son of Man*—just as we have βασιλεύς without the article, as much the emphatic titular name for the king of Persia, as those equally applied to him, whether ὁ βασιλεύς or ὁ μέγας βασιλεύς. =

Ver. 33. ὑμεῖς ἀπεστάλκατε πρὸς Ἰωάννην, καὶ μεμαρτύρηκε τῇ ἀληθείᾳ.—*Ye sent unto John, and he bare witness unto the truth.* R. *Ye have sent unto John, and he hath borne witness unto the truth.* +

Ver. 34. ἐγὼ δὲ οὐ παρὰ ἀνθρώπου τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω.—*But I receive not testimony from man.* R. *Howbeit the witness which I receive is not from man.* If so, τὴν μαρτυρίαν λαμβάνω = μαρτυρίαν ἣν λαμβάνω, which is surely questionable. Is it not more simply to be rendered—*But I receive not my witness* (that is, the witness borne to me, τὴν μ.) *from man.* The same truth is clearly expressed, ver. 41, δόξαν παρὰ ἀνθρώπων οὐ λαμβάνω.

Ver. 34. ἵνα ὑμεῖς σωθῆτε.—*That ye might be saved.* R. *That ye may be saved.* So may for might is better written continually. +

Ver. 35. ἐκεῖνος ἦν ὁ λύχνος ὁ καιόμενος καὶ φαίνων ὑμεῖς δὲ ἠθελήσατε ἀγαλλιασθῆναι πρὸς ὧραν ἐν τῷ φωτὶ αὐτοῦ.—*He was a burning and a shining light; and ye were willing for a season to rejoice in his light.* R. *He was the lamp, lighted and shining, and ye were willing to rejoice for awhile in his light.* ὁ λύχνος is manifestly the lamp. Middleton seems to think

that it was a phrase in common use, as applied personally to St. John. And Trench is certainly right in saying that, with reference to St. John, it is contrasted with τὸ φῶς, the true Light, or Christ. Both the A. V. and R. translate as if it were *καιόμενος*, and not ὁ *καιόμενος*. Again, *καιομ. κ. φαιν.*, if *burning and shining*, that is merely ἐν δια δυνῶν, to imply brightly burning; if *lighted and shining*, then the latter is the consequence of the former; and in a spiritual sense says, that John shone forth *because* he was kindled, or illuminated, from on high. Of course this is true, and would be the proper translation, if *καιόμενος* must of necessity be taken as a passive participle. This would be the strict, but is not the invariable usage. For instance, αἰεὶ δὲ πυραὶ νεκύων καλοντο θαμειαί.—II. a. 52. *καλοντο* is not *incendebantur* but *comburebantur*. So Herod. 2. 130, πάννυχος λύχνος παρακαλεται—a lamp is kept burning all night long. If we go to examples from N. T., οἱ λύχνοι *καιόμενοι*, Luc. xii. 35, may, as in this verse of St. John, be taken in either sense. But surely λαμπάδες *καιόμεναι*, Rev. iv. 5; Ib. viii. 10, must in both cases be *burning*. The great point gained, however, by R., is preserving the ὁ λύχνος.

Ver. 36. ἐγὼ δὲ ἔχω τὴν μαρτυρίαν μείζω τῷ Ἰωάννῃ.—*But I have greater witness than that of John.* R. *But the testimony which I have is greater than John.* This is open to the same objection as ver. 34. Moreover, to say that the testimony is greater than John, is at least an awkward expression. The A. V. stands very well; it only requires the ellipsis of τῆς, which is no unusual construction. Thus Elmsley, *Med.*, 85, explains *Hec.*, 982, μήδ' ἔρα τῶν πλησίον, pro τῶν τῶν πλησίον. It is much what Jelf, 781, d., calls "comparatio compendiaria." Why it is τὴν μ. μ., Middleton explains p. 1, viii. 1.

Ver. 37. καὶ ὁ πέμψας με Πατήρ αὐτὸς μεμαρτύρηκε περὶ ἐμοῦ.—*And the Father himself, which hath sent me, hath borne witness of me.* R. *And the Father which sent me, himself hath borne witness of me.*

Ver. 39. ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφὰς.—*Search the Scriptures.* R. *Ye search the Scriptures.* Scholefield's reasons for the indicative, rather than the imperative, are conclusive.

Ver. 44. πῶς δύνασθε ὑμεῖς πιστεῦσαι, δόξαν παρὰ ἀλλήλων λαμβάνοντες, καὶ τὴν δόξαν τὴν παρὰ τῷ μόνῳ Θεῷ οὐ ζητεῖτε.—*How can ye believe, which receive honour one of another, and seek not the honour that cometh from God only?* R. *How can ye believe, while ye receive glory one of another, and seek not the glory which is from the only God?* The pres. part. λαμβ. is better given; δοξ. hardly required altering; but τῷ μόνῳ Θ. is unquestionable.

Ver. 45. εἰς ὃν ὑμεῖς ἠλπίζατε.—*In whom ye trust.* R. *In whom ye hope.* Scarcely worth while, for *hope* implies *trust*, and ἔλπ. is continually used in this combined sense in N. T. The past present sense of ἠλπίζ. it is hardly possible to give. It is noticeable that St. Paul, using the word six times, in four of them uses this tense. =

CHAPTER VI.

Ver. 4. ἡ ἑορτὴ τῶν Ἰουδαίων.—*A feast of the Jews.* R. *The feast of the Jews ; κατ' ἐξοχὴν.* The absence of the article, chap. v. 1, may be a clue to determining what feast that was *not*. Matt. xxvi. 5, we have ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ distinctly for the Passover ; whereas xxvii. 15, just as clearly of the Passover, it is κατὰ δὲ ἑορτήν. Here the article is omitted because of the preposition ; see Middleton vi. 1. +

Ver. 5. ἐπάρας ἐν ὃ Ἰησοῦς τὰς ὀφθαλμούς, καὶ θεασάμενος ὅτι. κ.τ.λ.—*When Jesus then lifted up his eyes, and saw.* R. *Jesus then, lifting up his eyes, and seeing.* The A. V. renders as if there were two verbs in the original ; but the R. scarcely mends this by rendering it by two present participles. *Jesus, then, upon lifting up his eyes, and beholding.* "Ἐρχεται, come. R. *cometh, rather is coming.* Πόθεν ἀγοράσομεν—*whence shall we buy ?* R. *Whence are we to buy ?* How is this better ? —

Ver. 6. τὸτο δὲ ἔλεγε πειράζων.—*And this he said to prove him.* R. *But this he said proving him.* Would not πειράζων be better expressed, *testing him, or putting him to the proof ?* —

Ver. 7. διακοσίων δηνάρων ἄρτοι.—*Two hundred pennyworth of bread.* R. *Also.* But is it well to leave δην. here and in other places *a penny ?* e. g., Luke x. 35, δύο δηνάρια ἐκβαλὼν—*he took out twopence,* conveys anything but a correct idea to the common congregation. Similarly, Luke xv. 8, δραχμὰς δέκα, is expressed *ten pieces of silver,* with *drachma* in the margin. There seems no reason why these coins should not be retained in their own names. Again, is not ἄρτοι, rather *loaves,* as ver. 9 it is, and as ver. 5 it might as well be ? So we might render it *loaves worth two hundred denars are not sufficient,* adding in the margin the true value of the coin. =

Ver 9. ἔστι παιδάριον ἐν ᾧδε.—*There is a lad here.* R. *There is a little lad here.* Scarcely needed ; *lad* in earlier language would imply the same. If altered, might it not rather mean *a poor boy ?* The diminutive itself is almost confined to comic writers in Cl. Greek. In the same way the similar form ἀνδράρια, is used even in a contemptuous sense, Acharn., 516. Παιδ. does not occur again in N. T. =

Ver. 12. τὰ περισσεύσαντα κλάσματα.—*The fragments that remain.* R. *That remain over.* Perhaps expresses περι. more clearly. =

Ver. 13. κοφίνες κλασμάτων.—*Baskets with the fragments.* R. *Baskets with fragments.* +

Ver. 14. ἰδόντες.—*When they had seen.* R. *When they saw.* +

Ver. 14. ἔτός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς ὁ προφήτης ὁ ἐρχόμενος εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—*This is of a truth that prophet that should come into the world.* R. *This is of a truth the prophet that cometh into the world.* 'Ο ἐρχ., rather *that is to come.* 'Ο μέλλον ἐρχεσθαι, is ordained to come, being as Pref. xiv expresses it, "The peculiar title;" equivalent in fact to the Messiah. —

Ver. 15. Ἰησῆς ἔν γινῆς ὅτι μέλλουσιν ἐρχεσθαι καὶ ἀρπάζειν αὐτὸν, ἵνα ποιήσωσιν αὐτὸν βασιλέα, ἀνεχώρησε πάλιν εἰς τὸ ὄρος αὐτὸς μόνος.—*When Jesus therefore perceived that they would come, and take him by force, to make him a king, he departed again into a mountain himself alone.* R. *Jesus therefore knowing that they would come and take him by force, to make him a king, withdrew again into the mountain himself alone.* 'Ανεχ. is in R. rendered as if it was ὑπάγω. Is not ἀνεχ. πάλιν merely a pleonasm, as ἀναχωρέον ὀπίσω, Her., vii. 225? Jesus therefore, aware that they are about to come and seize him, to make him king, retired back to the mountain himself alone. Αὐτὸς μόνος is peculiar, and means perhaps only μόνος strengthened; yet Cf. Herm., Opusc., i. 338, αὐτὸ μόνον.

Ver. 17. καὶ ἐμβάντες εἰς τὸ πλοῖον, ἤρχοντο πέραν τῆς θαλάσσης.—*And entered into a ship, and went over.* R. *And entered into the ship, and were going over.* Ἠρχοντο is an imperfect, but is not τὸ πλοῖον, *their vessel?* Cf. Middleton on Matt. xiii. 2. *And after entering into their vessel, they were going across the sea.* —

Ver. 17. καὶ σκοτία ἤδη ἐγεγόνει, καὶ οὐκ ἐληλύθει πρὸς αὐτὰς ὁ Ἰησῆς.—*And it was now dark, and Jesus was not come to them.* R. *And darkness had now come on, and Jesus was not come to them.* Catching the force of ἐγεγόνει, why miss ἐληλ. and ἤδη? *And darkness had already come on, and Jesus had not come to them.* —

Ver. 18. ἡ τε θάλασσα, ἀνέμῃ μεγάλῃ πνέοντος, διηγείρετο.—*And the sea arose by reason of a great wind that blew.* R. *And the sea was rising by reason of a great wind that blew.* Διηγείρετο is certainly the imperfect, but it is passive; if changed at all, why not literally rendered—*And the sea, a violent wind blowing, was stirred up?* —

Ver. 19. ἐληλακότες ἔν.—*So when they had rowed.* R. *Also. Having rowed therefore.* —

Ver. 19. καὶ ἐγγὺς τῷ πλοίῳ γιγνόμενον.—*And drawing nigh unto the ship.* R. Also. *And being near, i. e., beside their vessel.* Compare *Thuc.* i. 49, αἱ Ἀττικάι νῆες, παραγιγνομεναι τοῖς Κερκυραίοις.—*Ib.* ii. 95. Ἔδει γὰρ καὶ τὰς Ἀθηναίους ναυσί τε καὶ στρατιᾷ, ὥς πλείστη, ἐπὶ τὰς Χαλκιδέας παραγενέσθαι.

Ver. 20. ἐγὼ εἰμι.—*It is I.* R. Also. How impossible it is to approach in English the mystical ἐγὼ εἰμι.

Ver. 21. ἤθελον ἐν λαβεῖν αὐτὸν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.—*Then they willingly received him into the ship.* R. *Then they were willing to receive him into the ship.* This hardly gives ἤθελον—*wished*, perhaps, is too strong. In the parallel, *Mark* vi., we have, ver. 48, καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν αὐτοῖς, A. V., *would have passed by them*; and ver. 51, ἀνέβη πρὸς αὐτοῖς εἰς τὸ πλοῖον. For ver. 48, Cf. *Luke* xxiv. 25, καὶ αὐτὸς προσεποιεῖτο πορρώτέρω πορεύεσθαι. We may render, *Then they would (or were fain to) take him up into their vessel.* In Cl. Gk. we should expect, perhaps, ἀσμένως ἔλαβον, or even Cf. *Acts* ii. 41, ἀσμένως ἀποδεξάμενοι.

Ver. 22. ὁ ὄχλος . . . ἰδὼν.—*When the people saw.* R. *The multitude having seen.* The change in the substantive needless, the aor. part. incorrectly given as a perfect.

Ver. 23. ἀνέβησαν . . . ἀπῆλθον.—*Were entered . . . were gone away.* R. *Entered . . . went away.* Not that the A. V. meant otherwise.

Ver. 23. συνεισῆλθε.—*Went not with.* R. *Went not together with.* If worth altering=*entered not together with.*

Ver. 23.—πλοιάριον. Steph. πλοῖον.—*Boat.* R. *Ship.* This, if adopted, supposes the verse to speak of two kinds of vessels.

Ver. 23. ὅπου ἔφαγον τὸν ἄρτον, εὐχαριστήσαντος τῷ Κυρίῳ.—*Where they did eat bread, after that the Lord had given thanks.* R. *Where they ate the bread, when the Lord had given thanks.* Correct so far as marking that ἔφαγον is not an imperfect, and expressing the emphatic τὸν ἄρτον. But here, as frequently, R. renders the aor. part. questionably, to say the least of it.

Ver. 24. ἐδὲ οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ, ἐνέβησαν [καὶ αὐτοὶ] εἰς τὰ πλοῖα.—*Neither his disciples, they also took shipping.* R. *Nor yet his disciples, they entered into the ships.* Is this at all improved, except with regard to ἐδὲ?

Ver. 26. σημεῖα.—*The miracles.* R. *Miracles.*

Ver. 27. ἐργάζεσθε μὴ τὴν βρῶσιν τὴν ἀπολλυμένην.—*Labour not for the meat which perisheth.* R. *Work not for the meat which perisheth.* Correct to render ἐργ. *work*, as it is the foundation of the varied repetitions of ἔργον and ἐργαζ. running through the subsequent verses. But may not the force of the

middle verb be expressed? *Work out for yourselves, not the perishable food*; τὴν ἀπολλυμ. = perituram. Cf. 1 Pet. i. 7, χρυσίis τῇ ἀπολλυμένῃ. Juven., i. 18, perituræ parcere chartæ. Ἀπόλλυμαι, in this sense, is often found in Cl. Grk., not so the participle. +

Ver. 27. τῷτον γὰρ ὁ Πατὴρ ἐσφράγισεν ὁ Θεός.—*For him hath God the Father sealed.* R. *For him hath the Father sealed, even God.* This more clearly gives the apposition between ὁ Π., and ὁ Θ.; but as ἐσφρ. is the aor., render—*For him the Father sealed, that is God.* Cf. Matt. xix. 17, ἔδεις ἀγαθὸς, εἰ μὴ εἷς, ὁ Θεός, *There is none good but one, that is, God.* —

Ver. 29. ἵνα πιστεύσητε.—*That ye believe.* R. *That ye should believe.* +

Ver. 29. ἀπέστειλεν.—*Hath sent.* R. *Sent.* On the same principle, ἐσφράγισεν, ver. 27 = *sealed*, not *hath sealed*. +

Ver. 30. τί οὖν ποιεῖς σὺ σημεῖον.—*What sign shewest thou then?* R. *What sign doest thou then?* In this verse we may preserve the middle τί ἐργάζῃ; *What do you yourself work?* the emphatic pronoun being expressed before in τί ποιεῖς σύ. =

Ver. 31. οἱ πατέρες ἡμῶν τὸ μάννα ἔφαγον ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ.—*Our fathers did eat manna in the desert.* R. *Our fathers ate the manna in the wilderness.* The first two corrections stand, as ver. 23. The terms *desert* and *wilderness* are frequently interchanged. Thus, Exod. xvi. 1, “The wilderness of Sin, which is between Elim and Sinai.” Exod. xix. 2, “For they were departed from Rephidim, and were come to the desert of Sinai, and had pitched in the wilderness.” There it is εἰς τὸν ἔρημον in both places in Sept. +

Ver. 32. οὐ Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ τῆ οὐρανῆ.—*Moses gave you not that bread from heaven.* R. *Moses hath not given you the bread from heaven.* The manna was the bread from heaven, but it was not the true, the spiritual bread, τὸν ἄρτον τὸν ἀληθινόν. The clearest light is thrown upon this passage by Bishop Turton, *On the Eucharist*, p. 196, seq. +

Ver. 33. ὁ γὰρ ἄρτος τῆ Θεῆ ἔστιν ὁ καταβαλὼν ἐκ τῆ ἐρανῆ.—*For the bread of God is he which cometh down from heaven.* R. *For the bread of God is that which cometh down from heaven.* This is Scholefield’s certain correction. +

Ver. 35. οὐ μὴ πεινάσῃ . . . οὐ μὴ διψήσῃ πώποτε.—*Shall never hunger . . . shall never thirst.* R. *Shall not hunger . . . shall never thirst.* If changed at all, why not, *Shall not hunger . . . shall not thirst, for ever?* —

Ver. 36. ὅτι καὶ ἐώρακάτε με, καὶ ἐ πιστεύετε.—*That ye also have seen me, and believe not.* R. *That ye have even seen me, and believe not.* It may be a question whether καὶ . . . καὶ do

not simply correspond here, as xv. 24, *καὶ ἑώρακασι καὶ μεμισή-
κασι*. But if the first *καὶ* be intensive, so in some measure is
the second. *Ye have even seen me, and ye do not believe.* —

Ver. 37. *πάν ὃ δίδωσί μοι ὁ Πατήρ.*—*All that the Father
giveth me.* R. *Whatsoever the Father giveth me.* The neuter
may in itself be more strictly *whatsoever*, but then the *τὸν
ἐρχόμενον* which follows, shews that it is for the masculine=
every one or *all*, as the R. has left it unaltered in ver. 39. —

Ver. 38. *καταβέβηκα.*—*I came down.* R. *I am come down.* +

Ver. 39. *τῷτο δέ ἐστι τὸ θέλημα τῷ πέμψαντός.*—*And this is
the Father's will which hath sent me.* R. *And this is the will of
him that sent me.* No doubt, *ὁ πέμψας* is often emphatically
used in this sense by itself; but in ver. 44, it is *ὁ Πατήρ ὁ
πέμψας*. Here it is only a question of text. =

Ver. 40. *ἵνα πᾶς ὁ θεωρῶν τὸν Ὑιὸν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς αὐτὸν,
ἔχῃ ζωὴν αἰώνιον, καὶ ἀναστήσω αὐτὸν ἐγὼ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ.*
—*That every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may
have everlasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.*
R. *That every one which looketh on the Son, and believeth in
him, should have everlasting life, and that I should raise him up
at the last day.* Middleton has noticed the absence of the
article from the second participle, marking that the two con-
ditions are combined—*looketh on* may better express *ὁ θεωρῶν*
than *seeth*. Cf. ver. 62, and Pearson, p. 108. The subjunctival
should rather than the potential *may*=*ἔχῃ*. It seems at first
sight as if ver. 40 were a stronger reiteration of ver. 39, and
therefore that *ἀναστήσω* must be subj. aor. But then, in verses
44, 54, it is distinctly a future. It is almost a temptation to
make it a future also in ver. 39, with a fuller stop at *αὐτῷ* and
rendering *ἀλλὰ yea*. There would then be a clear parallelism
between the two verses, and the future *ἀναστήσω* would express
the promise of the Saviour four times repeated. *This is the
will of Him that sent me, that of all which He hath given me
I should lose nothing; yea, I will raise it up at the last day.*

Then the same truth is repeated in more definite terms.

*This is the will of Him that sent me, that every one which
looketh on the Son, and believeth on Him, should have ever-
lasting life; and I will raise him up at the last day.* We may
notice, too, the singular position of *ἐγὼ*, as compared with its
omission, in ver. 39, and its natural place before *ἀναστήσω*, in
verses 44, 54. +

Ver. 42. *πῶς ἔν λέγει ἕτος· ὅτι ἐκ τῷ ἑρᾶνῃ καταβέβηκα;*—
How is it then that he saith, I came down from heaven? R. *How
then doth this man say, I am come down from heaven?* +

Ver. 45. *πᾶς οὖν ὁ ἀκέσας παρὰ τῷ Πατρὶ καὶ μαθὼν, ἔρχεται*

πρὸς με.—*Every man therefore that hath heard and hath learned of the Father, cometh unto me.* R. *Every man therefore that hath heard from the Father, and hath learned, cometh unto me.* This difference of rendering is attained by putting the stop after Πατρός. But then it disjoins the two participles, which, as in ver. 40, are combined together; and it loses sight of the antithesis between μαθὼν παρὰ τῷ Πατρί and διδάκτοι Θεῶ, for which it is in fact a convertible term. —

Ver. 46. ὁ ὢν παρὰ τῷ Θεῷ.—*He which is of God.* R. *He which is from God.* +

Ver. 48. ἐγώ εἰμι ὁ ἄρτος τῆς ζωῆς.—*I am that bread of life.* R. *I am the bread of life.* So Scholefield. +

Ver. 49. ἔφαγον καὶ ἀπέθανον.—*Did eat and are dead.* R. *Ate and they died.* Or, rather, omitting the pronoun,—*Your fathers ate the manna in the wilderness, and died.* —

Ver. 51. καὶ ὁ ἄρτος δέ.—*And the bread.* R. *Yea, and the bread.* The translators may be excused for not observing the nicety of the divided καὶ δε. They have indeed expressed it, 1 John i. 3, καὶ ἡ κοινωνία δὲ ἡ ἡμετέρα,—*and truly our fellowship.* +

Ver. 52. ἐμάχοντο.—*Strove.* R. *Contended.* =

Ver. 54. ὁ τρώγων.—*Whoso eateth.* R. *He that eateth.* +

Ver. 57. διὰ τὸν Πατέρα δι' ἐμέ.—*By.* R. *By reason of.* As better expressing the cause or source of the life. +

Ver. 60. σκληρός ἐστιν ἔπος ὁ λόγος.—*This is a hard saying.* R. *This saying is hard.* Remembering Matt. vii. 13, πλατεία ἡ πύλη, καὶ ἐνυπόχωρος ἡ ὁδός, one would almost be inclined to render—*hard is this saying.* +

Ver. 61. εἰδὼς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ἐν ἑαυτῷ, ὅτι γογγύζουσιν περὶ τούτου οἱ μαθηταὶ αὐτοῦ.—*When Jesus knew in himself that his disciples murmured at it.* R. *But Jesus knowing in himself that his disciples were murmuring at this.* Rather, *But Jesus aware within himself that his disciples are murmuring about this.* This retains γογγύζουσιν in its present force, and serves to express περὶ. =

Ver. 62. ἐὰν οὖν θεωρῇτε.—*What and if ye shall see.* R. *What then if ye should behold.* The first correction is Scholefield's. In ver. 40, R. rendered ὁ θεωρῶν he that *looketh* instead of *seeth*; it would be well to retain the same term in both places, whether *behold* or *look*. +

Ver. 63. πνεῦμά ἐστι καὶ ζωὴ ἐστιν.—*They are spirit, and they are life.* R. *Are spirit, and are life.* +

Ver. 64. καὶ τίς ἐστιν ὁ παραδώσων αὐτόν.—*And who should betray him.* R. *And who it was that should betray him.* Unless rather, *and who was to be his betrayer.* +

Ver. 65. διὰ τῆτο εἶρηκα ὑμῖν.—*Therefore said I unto you.*
 R. *For this cause have I said unto you.* +

Ver. 65. εἰ μὴ ἢ δεδομένον αὐτῷ ἐκ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου.—*Except it were given unto him of my Father.* R. *Except it have been given unto him of my Father.* Is it not, *Except it shall have been given unto him?* +

Ver. 66. ἐκ τότε.—*From that time.* R. *Upon this.* Ἐκ is not temporal but causal. +

Ver. 67. μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε ὑπάγειν.—*Will ye also go away.*
 R. *Are ye also minded to go away.* This avoids the ambiguous *will*, which might be mistaken as the mere future sign; though of course the translators used it, as Mark vi. 48, καὶ ἤθελε παρελθεῖν,—*and would have passed by them.* *Minded* is an expressive term, and frequently employed in the A. V., but it is curious that it is never so employed for ἐθέλω. Thus Matt. i. 19, it is ἐβελήθη, though μὴ θέλων *not willing* occurs in the same verse. In Acts xx. 13 it is μέλλων. Where, as it often is, it is so rendered in St. Paul's epistles, it is almost always φρονεῖν or its compounds. Our Lord's words are, *Whether are ye too wishing to go away?* In ὑπάγειν is implied, if not the stealth, at least the desertion of their going away; this it is not possible to express in literal translation. —

Ver. 69. καὶ ἡμεῖς πεπιστεύκαμεν καὶ ἐγνώκαμεν, ὅτι σὺ εἶ ὁ Χριστὸς.—*And we believe, and are sure that thou art that Christ.* R. *And we have believed, and know that thou art the Christ.* This passage exactly illustrates “ἐγνώκειναι = *novisse*, means to know by observation.”—Liddell and Scott, s. v. +

Ver. 70. οὐκ ἐγὼ ὑμᾶς τοὺς δώδεκα ἐξελεξάμην.—*Have not I chosen you twelve?* R. *Did I not choose you twelve?* But then we lose the aorist, and its middle force, and the article to the numeral, which is surely emphatic as in verses 67, 71. Should it not be rendered, *Chose I not unto myself you, the twelve?* Just as we have οἱ τριάκοντα for the council of Thirty, or for the tyrants. St. John employs ἐξελεξάμην three times again in the same sense, see especially xv. 16. —

Ver. 71. ἔλεγε δὲ τὸν Ἰῆδαν Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτην ἕτος γὰρ ἤμελλεν αὐτὸν παραδιδόναι.—*He spake of Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon; for he it was that should betray him.* R. *He spake of Judas Iscariot the son of Simon, for it was he that was about to betray him.* It is not desirable so to express it, but ἔλεγε = *he mean't*, in the sense so common in Greek tragedy, e. g., Trach. 9, ποταμός, Ἀχελῷον λέγω. Might not ἕτος γὰρ be more strongly marked, *for this man was about to betray him?* +

CHAPTER VII.

Ver. 4. ἴδεις γὰρ ἐν κρυπτῷ τι ποιεῖ καὶ ζητεῖ αὐτὸς ἐν παρρησίᾳ εἶναι.—*For there is no man that doeth anything in secret, and he himself seeketh to be known openly.* R. *For no man doeth anything in secret, and himself seeketh to be known openly.* This rightly omits the superfluous *there is*; but it makes αὐτὸς the nominative to ζητεῖ, which is governed by ἴδεις, whereas αὐτὸς goes with the infinitive εἶναι. Ἐν παρρησίᾳ is scarcely expressed by *openly*, it is much like Terent. *Adelph.*, 1, 2, 13, in ore 'st omni populo. Ἐν κρυπτῷ and ἐν παρρησίᾳ are directly opposed, and are both used adverbially. *For no man doeth anything secretly, and seeketh himself to be known publicly.* —

Ver. 4. φανέρωσον σεαυτὸν.—*Shew thyself.* R. *Manifest thyself.* =

Ver. 5. ἰδὲ γὰρ ἀδελφοὶ αὐτῷ ἐπίστευον.—*For neither did his brethren believe.* R. *For even his brethren did not believe.* Surely—*For not even did his brethren believe*—ne fratres quidem. —

Ver. 8. ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς ὁ ἐμὸς ἔπω πεπλήρωται.—*For my time is not yet full come.* R. Also. But does not ὅτι require the stronger *because*? and to an English ear, *fully come* sounds as if it were almost a compound of the word used ver. 6, *My time is not yet come.* So πάρεστιν and πεπλήρωται are confounded together, and the tense of the latter neglected. —

Ver. 10. ἀλλ' ὡς ἐν κρυπτῷ.—*But as it were in secret.* R. *But as in secret.* If altered at all, *But in a manner secretly.* —

Ver. 13. διὰ τὸν φόβον τῶν Ἰουδαίων.—*For fear of the Jews.* R. Also. But ought not the article to be expressed, *Through their fear of the Jews*? —

Ver. 14. ἤδη δὲ τῆς ἑορτῆς μεσέσης.—*Now about the midst of the feast.* R. *But when it was now the midst of the feast.* +

Ver. 14. ἐδίδασκε.—*And taught.* R. Also. Surely, *And was teaching.* —

Ver. 15. πῶς ἔτος γράμματα οἶδε, μὴ μεμαθηκώς;—*How knoweth this man letters, having never learned?* R. Also. To adopt *learning* from the margin of A. V. would clash awkwardly with *never learned*, though this is clearly the meaning of the word, and it is rendered so, Acts xxvi. 24, τὰ πολλὰ σε γράμματα εἰς μάτην περιτρέπει. The wonder of the Jews is like the scorn of Cicero against Antony—Neque ullas omnino literas nosse (2 Phil. § 4). Again, *literature* would be a totally unsuitable word for γράμματα, and yet *letters* certainly does not convey its true meaning to ordinary readers. —

Ver. 17. εἴαν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν.—*If any man*

will do his will. R. *If any man be minded to do his will.* This alteration is liable to the same objection as ch. v. 67. Moreover, the marked alliteration θέλη τὸ θέλημα should, if practicable, be preserved, *If any man be willing to do His will.* —

Ver. 18. ὁ ἀφ' ἑαυτῆ λαλῶν, τὴν δόξαν τὴν ἰδίαν ζητεῖ· ὁ δὲ ζητῶν τὴν δόξαν τῆ πέμψαντος αὐτὸν, ὅτος ἀληθὴς ἐστι, καὶ ἀδικία ἐν αὐτῷ οὐκ ἔστιν.—*He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory; but he that seeketh his glory that sent him, the same is true, and no unrighteousness is in him.* R. *He that speaketh of himself, seeketh his own glory; but he that seeketh the glory of him that sent him, the same is true, and there is no unrighteousness in him.* τ. δοξ. τ. πεμψ. is better expressed; ὁ π. being in fact almost a convertible term in St. John for ὁ Πατήρ. But ὅτος if not *this man*, should at any rate be *this same*; while ἀδ. ε. α. εκ. ε.=and unrighteousness is not in him. —

Ver. 19. οὐ Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὸν νόμον;—*Did not Moses give you the law?* R. *Hath not Moses given you the law?* +

Ver. 19. τί με ζητεῖτε ἀποκτείνειν;—*Why go ye about to kill me?* R. *Why seek ye to kill me?* For the more forcible, a more exact rendering, which also A. V. has, ver. 25. +

Ver. 21. ἐν ἔργον ἐποίησα.—*I have done one work.* R. *I did one work.* That διὰ τῆτο should be carried up to this verse from the following seems clear. Καὶ πάντες θαυμάζετε διὰ τῆτο, and ye all marvel at this. So Mark vi. 6, Καὶ ἐθαύμαζε διὰ τὴν ἀπιστίαν αὐτῶν. +

Ver. 22. [διὰ τῆτο] Μωσῆς δέδωκεν ὑμῖν τὴν περιτομὴν (οὐχ ὅτι ἐκ τῆ Μωσέως ἐστίν, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν πατέρων) καὶ ἐν σαββάτῳ περιτέμνετε ἄνθρωπον.—*Moses therefore gave unto you circumcision (not because it is of Moses, but of the fathers); and ye on the sabbath-day circumcise a man.* R. *For this cause hath Moses given you circumcision, not that it is of Moses, but of the fathers; and on the sabbath-day ye circumcise a man.*—How can διὰ τῆτο for this cause connect with what follows? If we ask for what cause, the answer must lie in the οὐχ ὅτι, which gives no answer at all. If διὰ τῆτο be joined with θαυμάζετε, the sense of both verses is clear. Οὐχ ὅτι=not that, is Scholefield's; τὴν περιτ., as distinguished from περιτ., ver. 23, should almost be *the rite of circumcision.* —

Ver. 23. ἐμοὶ χολᾶτε ὅτι ὅλον ἄνθρωπον ὑγιῇ ἐποίησα ἐν σαββάτῳ;—*Are ye angry at me, because I have made a man every whit whole on the sabbath-day?* R. *Are ye angry at me, because I made a man whole every whit on the sabbath-day?* The strange construction ὅλ. ὑγ., is supported by xiii. 10, καθαρὸς ὅλος; otherwise there is much temptation to take ὅλον as adj. masc., agreeing with ἄνθρωπον, and ὑγ., as predicate, as some have

proposed. "Ολον, for ὅλος, is in Cl. Gk. found with a substantive, as ὅλον ἁμάρτημα, Xen. Hell., 5, 3, 7, or with a verb, as διαφέρει ὅλον τε καὶ πᾶν, Pl. Men., 81, but scarcely, as in St. John, with an adjective. +

Ver. 26. μήποτε ἀληθῶς ἔγνωσαν οἱ ἄρχοντες, ὅτι ὁτός ἐστιν [ἀληθῶς] ὁ Χριστός.—*Do the rulers know indeed that this is the very Christ?* R. *Have the rulers come to know indeed that this man is the Christ?* This is rather a strong rendering of the aor., but perhaps it could scarcely be improved. The omission of the second ἀληθῶς cannot be doubtful. +

Ver. 28. ἔκραξεν οὖν ἐν τῷ ἱερῷ διδάσκων ὁ Ἰησῆς καὶ λέγων.—*Then cried Jesus in the temple as he taught, saying.* R. *Therefore cried Jesus, teaching in the temple, and saying.* Διδ. καὶ λεγ., must go together. The A. V. should therefore at least have been *as he taught, and said.* +

Ver. 29. ἐγὼ [δέ] οἶδα ὅτι παρ' αὐτῆ εἰμι.—*But I know him; for I am from him.* R. *I know him; because I am from him.* So far preferable, as the stronger *because* for ὅτι better expresses the reason why the Son knew the Father. +

Ver. 30. καὶ ἐδεῖς.—*But no man.* R. *And yet no man.* For this adversative, καί=καίτοι, Cf. Jelf, 759. 3. +

Ver. 32. ἤκουσαν οἱ Φαρισαῖοι τῇ ὄχλῳ γογγύζοντος περὶ αὐτῆ ταῦτα.—*The Pharisees heard that the people murmured such things concerning him.* R. *The Pharisees heard the multitude murmuring these things concerning him.* +

Ver. 33. ἔτι μικρὸν χρόνον μεθ' ὑμῶν εἰμι.—*Yet a little while am I with you.* R. Also. *Yet for a little while,* would better express both the Gk. accus., and our Lord's meaning. —

Ver. 34. καὶ ὅπου εἰμι ἐγὼ, ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν.—*And where I am, thither ye cannot come.* R. *And where I am, ye cannot come.* *Thither*, as *then*, in the previous verse, is additional and needless, but they are in italics in A. V. Whether εἰμι should be read, or εἰμι, from viii. 21, "Ὅπου ὑπάγω ὑμεῖς οὐ δύνασθε ἐλθεῖν, see one of Pearson's golden notes, p. 111. =

Ver. 35. πῶς ὁτός μέλλει πορεύεσθαι.—*Whither will he go?* R. *Whither will this man go?* Render, *Whither is this man about to go?* The force of μέλλει was retained by R., vi. 71, and vii. 39. —

Ver. 35. τὴν διασπορὰν τῶν Ἑλλήνων.—*The dispersed among the Gentiles.* R. *Greeks.* Which is in margin A. V. =

Ver. 36. τίς ἐστιν ὁτός ὁ λόγος ὃν εἶπε.—*What manner of saying is this that he saith?* R. *What is this saying that he said.* Scarcely more correct, and certainly weaker. —

Ver. 37. ἐν δὲ τῇ ἐσχάτῃ ἡμέρᾳ, τῇ μεγάλῃ τῆς ἑορτῆς.—*In the last day, that great day of the feast.* R. *Now in the last day, the great day of the feast.* =

Ver. 39. οὐπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον, ὅτι ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὐδέπω ἐδοξάσθη.—*For the Holy Ghost was not yet given; because that Jesus was not yet glorified.* R. *For the Holy Ghost was not yet; because neither was Jesus yet glorified.* The translators of course supplied διδόμενον, which is defended by Scholefield (on Middleton, p. 342), who compares Acts xxix. 2, ἀλλ' ἐδὲ εἰ Πνεῦμα ἅγιόν ἐστιν, ἠκέσαμεν. If instead of *given*, from xiv. 16, ἄλλον Παράκλητον δώσει, we prefer *sent*, from xiv. 26, πέμψει ὁ πατήρ, and xv. 26, ἐγὼ πέμψω; or *come*, from xvi. 7, ὁ Παράκλητος οὐκ ἐλεύσεται, the truth will be equally preserved. But to leave it with R., *the Holy Ghost was not yet*, would risk its being understood by inconsiderate readers, that the Holy Ghost did not yet exist. On this account alone, the translation perhaps is worth re-consideration.

Ver. 41. μὴ γὰρ ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας ὁ Χριστὸς ἔρχεται.—*Shall Christ come out of Galilee?* R. *Doth the Christ then come out of Galilee?* Scholefield, *What, doth Christ come?* The translators no doubt wrote *shall*, having regard to the peculiar force of ἔρχεται when used for the Advent; it is more than a present, scarcely to be made a full future. *What, is the Christ to come out of Galilee?*

Ver. 44. ἀλλὰ.—*But.* R. *Nevertheless;* almost more than is needed.

Ver. 47. μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς πεπλάνησθε.—*Are ye also deceived?* R. Also. Should it not be, *Have ye also been led astray?* So ver. 12, πλανᾷ τὸν ὄχλον might better perhaps be rendered, *he causeth the people to err.* This phrase, so frequent in A. V. of the prophetic books, is uniformly πλανᾶν in the Septuagint. Except in this chapter once, and four times in Matt. xxiv., πλανᾶν is not found in act. voice in N. T., but its causative sense is better expressed clearly.

Ver. 48. μή τις ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων ἐπίστευσεν εἰς αὐτὸν, ἢ ἐκ τῶν φαρισαίων.—*Have any of the rulers, or of the Pharisees believed on him?* R. *Hath any of the rulers believed in him, or of the Pharisees?*

Ver. 49. ἀλλ' ὁ ὄχλος ἔτος, ὁ μὴ γινώσκων τὸν νόμον, ἐπικατάρατοί εἰσι.—*But this people, who knoweth not the law, are cursed.* R. *But this multitude, which knoweth not the law, are cursed.* In this place, the substitution of *multitude* for *people*, elsewhere often immaterial, is quite needful, lest *people* should be mistaken for *nation*.

Ver. 51. μὴ ὁ νόμος ἡμῶν κρίνει τὸν ἄνθρωπον, ἐὰν μὴ ἀκέσῃ παρ' αὐτῷ πρότερον.—*Doth our law judge any man before it hear him?* R. *Doth our law judge a man except it first hear from him?* This is surely expressed with some awkwardness, and it

does not, better than A. V., give the τὸν ἄνθρωπον, which clearly has its meaning, whether κρινόμενον is to be supplied or not. —

Ver. 52. ἐρεύνησον καὶ ἵδε, ὅτι προφήτης ἐκ τῆς Γαλιλαίας οὐκ ἐγήγερται.—*Search and look, for out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.* R. *Search and see that out of Galilee ariseth no prophet.* The force of ὅτι is properly given, as expressing what they were to search for. It seems almost certain that the true reading must have been ὁ προφήτης, and then ἐγήγερται will have its proper force as a perfect. +

Ver. 53. R. Appends a marginal note here, stating that vii. 53 — viii. 11, “is wanting in the best ancient manuscripts.” But is it quite safe, according to the principle upon which the revision is avowedly carried out, to insinuate in this way a doubt as to a passage always received into the body of the Authorized Version? The note surely should have been omitted, or the question as to the genuineness of the passage should have been fully entered into. —

CHAPTER VIII.

Ver. 1. Ἰησοῦς δὲ ἐπορεύθη.—*Jesus went.* R. *But Jesus went.* This Scholefield notices, as connecting this verse with the previous chapter. +

Ver. 2. ὄρθρῃ.—*Early in the morning.* R. Also. More simply perhaps *at day-break.* —

Ver. 3. ἄγεισιν.—*Brought unto him.* R. *Bring unto him.* +

Ver. 5. σὺ ἔν τι λέγεις.—*But what sayest thou?* R. *What then sayest thou?* Render, *What therefore sayest thou?* —

Ver. 6. *As though he heard them not.* R. omits what is clearly a note carried into the text. +

Ver. 7. ὥς δὲ ἐπέμενον ἐρωτῶντες αὐτὸν.—*So when they continued asking him.* R. *But when they continued asking him.* The construction of ἐπεμ. with a participle here, and Acts xii. 16, ἐπέμενε κρέων, has authority from Pl. Meno. 93. +

Ver. 7. τὸν λίθον.—*A stone.* R. *The stone.* Middleton ingeniously adduces the use of the article in proof of the genuineness of this questioned passage. It may be doubted whether πρ. του λι. β., *first throw the stone*, is for *throw the first stone* (Deut. xvii. 7); or more simply *his stone*, that is the stone each had ready. +

Ver. 9. οἱ δὲ ἀκέσαντες, καὶ ὑπὸ τῆς συνειδήσεως ἐλεγχόμενοι, ἐξήρχοντο εἰς καθ' εἰς, ἀρξάμενοι ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων ἕως τῶν ἐσχάτων.—*And they which heard it, being convicted by their own conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the eldest, even unto the last.* R. *But they having heard it, and being convicted*

by their conscience, went out one by one, beginning at the elders, even unto the last. Οἱ δὲ ἀκ. aor., but they upon hearing it, ἐξήρχ. is imperf. began to go out, εἰς καθ' εἰς. Dobree Advers. ii. 568, adopts the old conjecture, εἰς, καθ' εἰς, which would seem much better, both here and Mark xiv. 19; but then it would fail us, Rom. xii. 5, ὁ δὲ καθ' εἰς; it had better, therefore, be left as an anomalous construction. Ἀπὸ τῶν πρεσβ. R. *Beginning at the elders*, with reference, it would seem, to the *Scribes and Pharisees*, ver. 3, but the comparative οἱ πρεσβύτεροι is commonly used, rather than the superlative. Cf. Elmsley, Med. 67. —

Ver. 10. ἐδείς σε κατέκρινεν;—*Hath no man condemned thee?* R. *Did no man condemn thee?* But κατέκρινεν may just as well, rather better, be the aorist, and not the imperfect. —

Ver. 12. ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ.—*In darkness.* R. *In the darkness* needless; as it would be to translate ἡ μεσημβρία the mid-day, rather than mid-day, in any case. —

Ver. 13. σὺ περὶ σεαυτοῦ μαρτυρεῖς.—*Thou bearest record of thyself.* R. *Thou art bearing witness of thyself.* Witness is, perhaps, an improvement upon record; but the other change seems unnecessary, or, at any rate, should have been changed also, ver. 14, into *I am bearing witness.* —

Ver. 14. οὐκ οἴδατε.—*Ye cannot tell.* R. *Ye know not*, as of course it should be, in contrast with ἐγὼ οἶδα, just before. +

Ver. 16. καὶ ἐὰν κρίνω δὲ ἐγὼ.—*And yet if I judge.* R. *Yea, and if I judge.* Ver. 17. καὶ ἐν τῷ νόμῳ δὲ—*It is also written.* R. *Moreover it is written.* It would be difficult to say in what respect the sense of καὶ . . . δὲ is better put in either case by R. =

Ver. 19. οὔτε ἐμὲ οἴδατε, οὔτε τὸν Πατέρα μου εἰ ἐμὲ ᾔδειτε, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μὲ ᾔδειτε ἂν.—*Ye neither know me, nor my Father; if ye had known me, ye should have known my Father also.* R. *Ye know neither me, nor my Father; if ye knew me, ye would know my Father also.* So the antithesis of the Saviour's words is correctly given, and the force of the peculiar tense ᾔδειτε. It might even, perhaps, be more clear to say, *if ye did know.* +

Ver. 20. διδάσκων.—*As he taught.* R. *As he was teaching.* As, perhaps, R. had better have been, vii. 28. +

Ver. 21. ἐν τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ ὑμῶν.—*In your sins.* R. *In your sin.* But is the singular purposely used here, or is not the same as ἐν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις, ver. 24? To render it sin would seem to imply some specific sin, which can scarcely be the case. If so, it would rather be ἀμαρτήματι. If the singular must be expressed, it should rather be *sinfulness.* This use of ἀμαρτία is very strong, Rom. v. Cf. especially verses 13, 14, τῇ ἀμαρτίᾳ, followed by ἀμαρτία. See also 1 John iii. 4, 5.

Ver. 24. εἰν γὰρ μὴ πιστεύσητε.—*For if ye believe not.* R. *For except ye believe.* +

Ver. 25. τὴν ἀρχὴν ὃ τι καὶ λαλῶ ὑμῖν.—*Even the same that I said unto you from the beginning.* R. *That which I also say unto you from the beginning.* This does not seem in any way to make this questionable sentence clearer: τὴν ἀρχὴν can scarcely be rendered *from the beginning*; is it not used adverbially *at first*? For the neuter ὃ τι, 1 John iii. 2, οὐπω ἐφανερώθη τί ἐσόμεθα has been compared. The present λαλῶ for the past has little difficulty. Perhaps, after all, we may consider the idiomatic τὴν ἀρχὴν to be used, as πάλαι so frequently is, with a present, ex. gr. Pers. 293, συγῶ πάλαι δύστηνος. Had the sentence run ὃ τι καὶ πάλαι λαλῶ ὑμῖν it would have meant much what it does mean—*That which I am also telling you this long while.* =

Ver. 26. καὶ γὰρ ἃ ἤκουσα παρ' αὐτοῦ, ταῦτα λέγω εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—*And I speak to the world those things which I have heard of him.* R. *And the things which I heard from him, these speak I unto the world.* The order of words in the original more closely observed only; but παρ' αὐτοῦ is much better *from* than *of him*. +

Ver. 27. ὅτι αὐτοῖς ἔλεγεν.—*That he spake unto them.* R. Also. *Why not, That he was speaking unto them.* —

Ver. 28. ὅταν ὑψώσητε.—*When ye have lifted up.* R. Also. *Rather, Whenever ye shall have lifted up.* —

Ver. 28. ἀλλὰ, καθὼς ἐδίδαξέ με ὁ Πατήρ.—*But as my Father hath taught me.* R. *But even as my Father taught me.* +

Ver. 29. τὰ ἀρεστὰ αὐτῷ.—*These things that please him.* R. *Those things that are pleasing to him.* +

Ver. 31. πρὸς τῆς πεπιστευκότας αὐτῷ Ἰουδαίους.—*To those Jews who believed on him.* R. *To those Jews which had believed him.* Marks the perf. part. and the dat. case instead of εἰς after πιστεύω. +

Ver. 33. καὶ οὐδενὶ δεδουλευκάμεν πώποτε· πῶς σὺ λέγεις· ὅτι ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε;—*And were never in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?* R. *And have never been in bondage to any man; how sayest thou, Ye shall be made free?* The perf. δεδουλ. correct; but to render ἐλεύθ. γενῆσ., *Ye shall be made free*, leads to the conclusion that the same word is used as ver. 32, ἐλευθερώσει, which is rightly given, *shall make you free.* Read, *And to no man have we been in bondage at any time; how dost thou say, Ye shall become free?* This change is made in R., chap. ix. 34. —

Ver. 34. πᾶς ὁ ποιῶν τὴν ἁμαρτίαν δέσλος ἐστὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας.—*Whosoever committeth sin is the servant of sin.* R. *Every one that committeth sin is the bondman of sin.* Bondman, of course,

answers better to the δέω from which δῆλος comes, and *bondage* was used, ver. 33. Trench notices δῆλος as opposed to ἐλεύθερος, Rev. xiii. 16. His remarks upon this and its kindred words are well worth attention—*Synonyms*, N. T., p. 34. +

Ver. 37. ἀλλὰ ζητεῖτέ με ἀποκτεῖναι, ὅτι ὁ λόγος ὁ ἐμὸς ἔχωρεῖ ἐν ὑμῖν.—*But ye seek to kill me, because my word hath no place in you.* R. *Nevertheless ye seek to kill me, because my word gaineth no ground among you.* α. ζ.=rather—and yet ye are seeking to kill me. Neither hath place, nor gaineth ground, seems to satisfy χωρεῖ. It may be inferred from pref. ix that their phrase scarcely was acceptable to the revisers themselves. The word is elsewhere used in N. T. with very doubtful meaning. Cf. Matt. xix. 11; and 2 Cor. vii. 2. —

Ver. 38. καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν.—*And ye.* R. *And ye likewise.* +

Ver. 40. ὃς τὴν ἀλήθειαν ὑμῖν λελαληκα, ἣν ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Θεοῦ.—*That hath told you the truth, which I have heard of God.* R. *That hath spoken unto you the truth, which I heard from God.* +

Ver. 41. τὰ ἔργα.—*The deeds.* R. *The works.* Cf. vi. 27. +

Ver. 42. καὶ ἤκω.—*And came.* R. *And am come.* +

Ver. 42. ἐδὲ γὰρ ἀπ' ἐμαυτοῦ ἐλήλυθα.—*Neither came I of myself.* R. *For neither am I come of myself.* The force of ἐδὲ is not given, and though ἐλήλυθα may be rendered *I am come*, here it would be confused with the preceding ἤκω. *For not even of myself have I come, but He sent me.* —

Ver. 44. θέλετε ποιεῖν.—*Ye will do.* R. *Ye love to do.* This seems far too strong=*Ye desire to do.* —

Ver. 44. ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ οὐχ ἔστηκεν ὅτι οὐκ ἔστιν ἀλήθεια ἐν αὐτῷ.—*And abode not in the truth.* R. *And standeth not in the truth.* The translators slipped both the meaning and tense of the verb. But certainly R. does not express well such a phrase. Cf. Acts xxvi., ἔστηκα μαρτυρόμενος, to render that in like manner, *I stand testifying*, would scarcely do. There A. V. has *continue*, which might do very well here; or even *abideth* would not be so objectionable. Render, *He is not settled in the truth, for truth is not in him.* —

Ver. 44. ὅταν λαλήῃ τὸ ψεῦδος, ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων λαλεῖ ὅτι ψεύστης ἐστὶ, καὶ ὁ πατὴρ αὐτοῦ.—*When he speaketh of a lie, he speaketh of his own; for he is a liar, and the father of it.* R. retains this, only changing *for* into *because*, and *of it* into *thereof*. Among the numerous alterations suggested by R., it seems very strange that this passage should have been left unaltered. There can hardly be a doubt as to the correctness of Middleton's criticism; or that his translation, as somewhat improved by Scholefield, is the true one—*When a man speaketh*

a lie, he speaketh of his own; for his father also is a liar. For the omission of *τις* as the nom., to *λαλή*, Bp. Middleton supplies abundant instances. A rather remarkable one is noticed by Piele, *Agam.*, 71, *ὁργὰς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει*, where *τις* understood, stands for *Agamemnon*.

Ver. 46. *ἐλέγχει*.—*Convinceth*. R. *Convicteth*. *Εἰ δὲ ἀλήθειαν λέγω*.—*If I say the truth*. R. *If I speak truth*; unless rather—*If I am speaking truth*. +

Ver. 47. *διὰ τῆτο*.—*Therefore*. R. *For this cause*. +

Ver. 52. *τὸν λόγον μου*.—*My saying*. R. *My word*. +

Ver. 53. *ἀπέθανε*.—*Is dead*. R. *Died*. +

Ver. 54. *δοξάζω*.—*Honour*. R. *Glorify*. +

Ver. 55. *καὶ οὐκ ἐγνώκατε αὐτὸν*.—*Yet ye have not known him*. R. *And ye know him not*. +

These last few verses afford more than usual occasion for mere verbal amendments.

CHAPTER IX.

Ver. 1. *καὶ παράγων*.—*And as Jesus passed by*. R. *And as he passed by*. If the narrative were in a continuous form, there would, of course, be no need to insert *Jesus*; but on account of the division into chapters, the translators wisely introduced the name from the concluding verse of the last, but in italics, to mark that it was an insertion. —

Ver 1. *τυφλὸν ἐκ γενετῆς*.—*Which was blind from his birth*. R. *Blind from his birth*. Only preferable in saving words; there can be no error in expressing *ὄντα*, which must be understood. —

Ver. 2. *ἵνα τυφλὸς γεννηθῇ*.—*That he was born blind*. R. *That he should be born blind*. "*ἵνα* is almost=*ὥστε*. +

Ver. 3. *οὔτε ἕτος ἥμαρτεν*.—*Neither hath this man sinned*. R. *Neither did this man sin*. This preserves the same rendering for the same word, *ἥμαρτεν*, in both verses. It would be just as well to omit the *did* in each case, rendering the aor. *Who sinned? neither this man sinned, nor his parents*. +

Ver. 4. *ἕως ἡμέρα ἐστὶν ἔρχεται νύξ*.—*While it is day, the night cometh*. R. Also. Why not, *night cometh*? The article is wanting to *νύξ*, as to *ἡμέρα*; both, therefore, should be translated alike. —

Ver. 5. *ὅταν ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὦ*.—*As long as I am in the world*. R. Also. Can any similar instance be given to warrant rendering *ὅταν*, *as long as*? —

Ver. 6. *καὶ ἐπέχρισε τὸν πηλὸν ἐπὶ τὰς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ*.—*And he anointed the eyes of the blind man with the clay*.

R. Also, only omitting *he*. But the marginal rendering A. V. gives the Greek more correctly. *Ἐπιχρίω* is used only in this chapter; nor, perhaps, often elsewhere, except now and then in the *Odyssey*, where it is constructed with dative. —

Ver. 7. *ὃ ἐρμηνεύεται*.—*Which is by interpretation*. R. *Which is interpreted*. The translators render as if it were the participle, as it is in the only two places in N. T., where it occurs again. The compound *μεθερμ.* is oftener found. +

Ver. 8. *ὅτι τυφλὸς ἦν*.—*That he was blind*. R. *That he was a beggar*; adopting *προσαίτης*. =

Ver. 13. *ἄγασιν*.—*They brought*. R. *They bring*. +

Ver. 17. *σὺ τί λέγεις περὶ αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ἤνοιξέ σου τοὺς ὀφθαλμούς;*—*What sayest thou of him, that he hath opened thine eyes?* R. *Seeing that he hath opened thine eyes*, reading, that is, *ὅτι* for *ὅτι*. Even so, *in that* would as well express it. But is it not more simple to read the words of the Pharisees as a double, and so more scornful question? *What sayest thou of him? that he hath opened thine eyes?* —

Ver. 22. *ἐάν τις αὐτὸν ὁμολογήσῃ Χριστὸν*.—*If any man did confess that he was Christ*. R. *If any man should acknowledge him as Christ*. +

Ver. 24. *ἐκ δευτέρου*.—*Again*. R. *The second time*. =

Ver. 24. *ὃς ἦν τυφλὸς*.—*That was blind*. R. *That had been blind*. A. V. of course means, *that was* (before) *blind*, which is far less harsh than to render *ἦν had been*. —

Ver. 24. *δοῦναι δόξαν τῷ θεῷ*.—*Give God the praise*. R. *Give glory to God*. +

Ver. 25. *εἰ ἁμαρτωλὸς ἐστίν, οὐκ οἶδα· ἐν οἶδα, ὅτι τυφλὸς ὦν, ἄρτι βλέπω*.—*Whether he be a sinner or no, I know not: one thing I know, that, whereas I was blind, now I see*. R. *Whether he is a sinner, I know not: one thing I know, that, being a blind man, now I see*. Certainly far less expressive in English, and not more accurately rendering the Greek. *Εἰ, whether*, always implies, if it does not express, an alternative; or *no*, A. V., is therefore properly in italics. The present part. *ὦν* is continually found in this strong sense, *inasmuch as I was*, or *whereas I was*; see note, chap. xi. 49. Cf. *Thuc.* i. 57, *Περδικκας ἐπεπολέμωτο, ξύμμαχος πρότερον καὶ φίλος ὦν*. Perdiccas had been rendered hostile, *whereas* before he was an ally and friend. —

Ver. 27. *μὴ καὶ ὑμεῖς θέλετε αὐτῷ μαθηταὶ γενέσθαι*;—*Will ye also be his disciples?* R. *Would you also be his disciples?* R. seem very much afraid lest this favourite *will* of A. V. should be mistaken for a future sign. But have they mended the sense here? The man asks the Pharisees, *Whether are ye also willing*

to become his disciples? The example given in Jelf, 873-4; for the μή interrogative, expecting a negative answer, is apposite enough, ἀλλὰ μή ἀρχιτέκτων βέλει γενέσθαι; οὐκ ἐν ἑγῶν, ἔφη.—Xen. Mem., iv., 2, 10.

Ver. 29. λελάληκεν ὁ Θεός.—*God spake.* R. *God hath spoken.* +

Ver. 29. τῆτον δὲ.—*As for this fellow.* R. *But as for this man.* There is nothing to warrant the contumelious term, A. V. +

Ver. 30. ἐν γὰρ τέτῳ.—*For herein.* R. Also. The reading ἐν γὰρ τοῦτο would more strongly express the man's scorn, if it had sufficient authority. =

Ver. 31. καὶ θέλημα αὐτῆ ποιῇ.—*And doeth his will.* R. *And do his will,* to express the conjunction after εἰ. But is it not somewhat hypercritical to think the change worth while? =

Ver. 32. ἐκ τῆ αἰῶνος οὐκ ἠκέσθη.—*Since the world began was it not heard.* R. *Since the world began it was never heard.* Is this at all improved? Perhaps οὐκ ἠκέσθη rather is, *Hath it not been heard?* —

Ver. 32. τυφλῆ γεγεννημένε.—*Of one that was born blind.* R. *Of a man born blind;* see ver. 1. —

Ver. 34. ἐν ἀμαρτίαις σὺ ἐγεννήθης ὅλος.—*Altogether born in sins.* R. *Wholly born.* The English word nearer akin to the Greek, otherwise no better expressed. =

Ver. 35. καὶ εὗρὼν αὐτόν.—*And when he had found him.* R. *And he found him.* Surely, *And after finding him.* —

Ver. 37. καὶ ὁ λαλῶν μετὰ σοῦ ἐκεῖνός ἐστι.—*And it is he that talketh with thee.* R. *And he it is that talketh with thee.* Should it not be, *And he that talketh with thee is he.* Cf. iv. 26, the yet stronger expression, and the order of the words inverted, ἐγὼ εἰμι, ὁ λαλῶν σοι. —

Ver. 39. ἦλθον.—*I am come.* R. *Came I.* That it may not be mistaken for ἦκω. +

Ver. 39. τυφλοὶ γένωνται.—*Might be made blind.* R. *Might become blind.* This is exactly the correction which R. should have made, viii. 33, ἐλεύθεροι γενήσεσθε. +

Ver. 40. ἐκ τῶν Φαρισαίων οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆ.—*And some of the Pharisees which were with him.* R. *And those of the Pharisees which were with him.* So Scholefield. +

Ver. 40. μή καὶ ἡμεῖς τυφλοὶ ἐσμεν;—*Are we blind also?* R. *Are we also blind?* +

Ver. 41. εἰ τυφλοὶ ἦτε, οὐκ ἂν εἶχετε ἀμαρτίαν.—*If ye were blind, ye should have no sin.* R. *If ye were blind, ye would not have sin.* Which is what A. V. meant to say. +

CHAPTER X.

Ver. 4. καὶ ὅταν ἐκβάλῃ.—*And when he putteth forth.* R. *And when he hath put forth.* Better to express the indefinite ὅταν, and *whenever he putteth forth.* —

Ver. 5. ἄλλοτρίῳ δὲ οὐ μὴ ἀκολουθήσωσι.—*And a stranger will they not follow.* R. *But a stranger they will not follow.* Is not the strengthened negative οὐ μὴ better expressed by A. V.? Further on, τῶν ἄλλοτρίων is retained *strangers*, not marking the article, whereas it is ἄλλοτρίῳ in the former part of the verse. —

Ver. 9. καὶ εἰσελεύσεται καὶ ἐξελεύσεται καὶ νομὴν εὕρήσει.—*And shall go in and out and find pasture.* R. *And shall go in and go out, and shall find pasture.* Even *shall* expressed again before *go out*, would be as well. +

Ver. 10. ἐγὼ ἦλθον, ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσι, καὶ περισσὸν ἔχωσι.—*I am come that they might have life, and that they might have it more abundantly.* R. *I came that they might have life, and that they might have it abundantly.* ἦλθον is of course *I came*, but why not, after this aor., render the conjunct. ἔχωσι *may have*? The expression περισσὸν is surely weakened by omitting *more*, which in A. V. was clearly not intended to imply a comparative, but a strong word. Mark vi. 51, we have λίαν ἐκ περισσῆς; vii. 36, μᾶλλον περισσότερον, and three times by St. Paul, the yet stranger and stronger ὑπερεκπερισσῆς. —

Ver. 11. τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς τίθησιν.—*Giveth his life.* R. *Layeth down his life*, as Scholefield properly translates it, because so translated verses 15, 17. The A. V. seems first to have given the simple meaning as if it had been δίδωσι, as it is Matt. xxi. 28, καὶ δέναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτῆς λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν. The use of τίθησιν is peculiar to St. John, who, besides this chapter, has it again xiii. 37, 38; and, as it would seem, with direct reference to our Lord's words recorded here, 1 Ep. iii. 16. In this sense τίθησιν is used for its compound κατατίθησιν. Almost in the kindred sense of *depositing* or *staking* as a prize, we have both simple and compound verb together in Theocritus viii. 11—14.

Χρήσδεις καταθεῖναι ἀέθλον;
Μόσχον ἐγὼ θήσω.

+

Ver. 12. καὶ ὁ λύκος ἀρπάζει αὐτὰ.—*And the wolf catcheth them.* R. *And the wolf teareth them.* Not of any consequence; but so the use of this word in Homer is explained, *corripio dentibus* (Damm. Lex.) An example from Homer exactly corresponds with ἀρπάζει καὶ σκορπίζει here—

+

Τὼ μὲν ἄρ' ἀρπάζοντε βόας καὶ ἴφια μῆλα,
Σταθμὲς ἀνθρώπων κερατίζετον.^a

+

Ver. 14. καὶ γινώσκω τὰ ἐμὰ, καὶ γινώσκομαι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐμῶν.—*And know my sheep, and am known of mine.* R. *And know mine own, and am known of mine.* A. V. has *sheep* in Italics; but it is better omitted, to preserve the antithesis between τὰ ἐμὰ and τῶν ἐμῶν.

+

Ver. 15. καθὼς γινώσκει με ὁ Πατήρ, καὶ γὼ γινώσκω τὸν Πατέρα.—*As the Father knoweth me, even so know I the Father.* R. *Even as the Father knoweth me, and I know the Father.* This is a manifest, and very well known emendation; it is adopted by Scholefield, the substance of whose note is well put in the Preface of Revisers, vi.

+

Ver. 16. καὶ γενήσεται μία ποίμνη, εἰς ποιμήν.—*And there shall be one fold, and one shepherd.* R. *And there shall be one flock, one shepherd.* A decided improvement to omit the weakening expletive, and to distinguish ποίμνη from αὐλή, and that by a word which more closely connects it with its kindred ποιμήν.

+

Ver. 17. ὅτι ἐγὼ τίθημι τὴν ψυχὴν μου, ἵνα πάλιν λάβω αὐτήν.—*Because I lay down my life that I might take it again.* R. *Because I lay down my life that I may take it again.* It is not perhaps practicable to render this otherwise, so as to express that ἵνα λάβω is not the cause why τίθησι τὴν ψυχὴν, but that it implies that λαβεῖν τ. ψ. will be the future consequence of τιθέναι τ. ψ.

=

Ver. 18. ἔλαβον.—*Have I received.* R. *Received I.*

+

Ver. 19. διὰ τὰς λόγους τῆς τῆς.—*For these sayings.* R. *Because of these sayings.* Rather, *On account of these (his) words.* Twice in chap. viii. 51, 52, R. thought it needful to alter saying into word for λόγον.

—

Ver. 21. ταῦτα τὰ ῥήματα οὐκ ἐστὶ δαιμονιζόμενος.—*These are not the words of him that hath a devil.* R. *These words are not the words of one that hath a devil.* Here, on the contrary, ῥήματα, in itself, and to distinguish it from the preceding λόγους, may better be sayings; δαιμονιζόμενος = *one possessed of a devil*, and so exactly answers to δαιμόνιον ἔχει in the previous verse; moreover, it is the genitive case, not governed by ῥήματα understood as R., but by ἐστὶ, Jelf, 521.

—

Ver. 22. ἐγένετο δὲ τὰ ἐγκαίνια ἐν τοῖς Ἱεροσολύμοις.—*And it was at Jerusalem the feast of the dedication.* R. *Now it was the feast of the dedication at Jerusalem.* Merely the order of the words more closely followed.

=

Ver. 23. καὶ περιεπάτει ὁ Ἰησοῦς.—*And Jesus walked.* R. *And Jesus was walking.* +

Ver. 24. ἕως ποτε τὴν ψυχὴν ἡμῶν αἶρεις;—*How long dost thou make us to doubt?* Or, *hold us*, marg. R. *How long dost thou hold our mind in suspense?* Any satisfactory meaning for αἶρεις is scarcely to be hoped for. To take it as ver. 18, to *slay*, is quite out of the question; to substitute αἰωρεῖς is a mere expedient, and would hardly be Greek. Some such rendering as A. V. or R. gives, must be the sense of the passage. The word, but then it is passive in both instances, is employed for mental agitation,

Ἡ κάρτα πρὸς γυναῖκας, αἶρεσθαι κέαρ.^b

And

Τί ποτ' αἶρομαι ἐννυχος οὕτω
Δείμασι, φάσμασι.^c =

Ver. 26. ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς οὐ πιστεύετε· οὐ γάρ ἐστε ἐκ τῶν προβάτων τῶν ἐμῶν.—*But ye believe not, because ye are not of my sheep.* R. *Nevertheless, ye believe not; for ye are not of my sheep.* Ἀλλὰ = *and yet*; the stronger *because* seems to suit γάρ better, since their not being his sheep, is given as the express reason why they did not believe. —

Ver. 28. καὶ οὐχ ἀρπάσει τις.—*Neither shall any man pluck.* But *man* in italics. R. *And none shall tear them.* This, and the correction of *none* for *no man*, ver. 29, is due to Scholefield, *q. v.* To render ἀρπ. *tear*, is questionable here, because it seems to carry with it the same sense as ver. 12, where it is *rend* or *tear in pieces* of a beast of prey. +

Ver. 30. ἐγὼ καὶ ὁ Πατήρ ἐν ἐσμεν.—*I and my Father are one.* R. *I and the Father are one.* This perhaps is better, though *my* in A. V. is in italic, and must be understood, as it is twice expressed in the last verse. +

Ver. 31. ἐβάστασαν οὖν πάλιν λίθους οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι.—*Then the Jews took up stones again.* R. *The Jews therefore took up stones again.* Οὖν in this instance requires *therefore* to express that what our Lord had said, caused the Jews to attempt to stone him. It would be desirable if some better word could be found for ἐβάστασαν than *took up*; it is not as viii. 59, ἦραν ἐν λίθους. The passage which has been quoted in support of *took up*, is no support at all; there Sisyphus is represented λαῶν βαστάζοντα πελώριον ἀμφοτέρησιν (*Od. xi. 594*) = trying to raise a huge stone with both hands—that is, to lift it up the hill. In *Agam. 35*, χέρα . . . τῇδε βαστάσαι χερί = *to grasp*, but even so with the idea rather of holding or supporting. +

^b *Agam.*, 575.

^c *Eur. Hec.*, 69.

Ver. 35. *καὶ ἡ δύναται λυθῆναι ἡ γραφή.*—*And the Scripture cannot be broken.* R. *And the Scripture cannot be made void.* Because it would not be a violation, but a non-fulfilment of the Scripture. +

Ver. 36. *ἡγίασε.*—*Hath sanctified.* R. *Sanctified.* +

Ver. 37. *εἰ δὲ ποιῶ.*—*But if I do.* R. *But if I do them.* Necessary to shew that *do* answers to *do not*; is a verb, that is, and not the sign of a tense. +

Ver. 39. *καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐκ τῆς χειρὸς αὐτῶν.*—*But he escaped out of their hand.* R. *And he passed out of their hand.* Safer so to render the single word; the act itself is more fully expressed viii. 59. +

Ver. 40. *ὅπερ ἦν Ἰωάννης τὸ πρῶτον βαπτίζων.*—*Where John at first baptized.* R. *Where John was at first baptizing.* +

Ver. 41. *πολλοὶ ἦλθον πρὸς αὐτὸν.*—*Many resorted unto him.* R. *Many came to him.* =

Ver. 41. *Ἰωάννης μὲν ἐποίησεν.*—*John did.* R. *John indeed did.* Here, as before, chap. viii., we have several verbal corrections, worth noticing perhaps, but of scant weight towards disturbing the received version of this Gospel. +

CHAPTER XI.

Ver. 1. *ἦν δέ τις ἀσθενῶν, Λάζαρος ἀπὸ Βηθανίας, ἐκ τῆς κώμης Μαρίας καὶ Μάρθας τῆς ἀδελφῆς αὐτῆς.*—*Now a certain man was sick named Lazarus of Bethany, the town of Mary and her sister Martha.* R. *Now there was a certain man sick, named Lazarus, from Bethany, of the town of Mary and her sister Martha.* The changes are of little importance, though certainly improvements. For it is not *ἡσθένει*, and *ἀπο* with *ἐκ* should be expressed as in i. 45. Instead of supplying *named*, Lazarus may be taken as the common apposition to *τις*, a certain man, Lazarus, *i. e.* It is altogether a different case, verse 16, and if R. adhered, as usual, to the order of the words, they would run, *the town (or hamlet, rather) of Mary and of Martha her sister.* =

Ver. 6. *ὥς οὖν ἤκουσεν.*—*When he had heard therefore.* R. *When therefore he heard.* Scholefield better renders it, *When he heard then*, objecting, with reason, that *therefore* would imply that *because* Jesus loved Lazarus *therefore* he delayed going. —

Ver. 6. *τότε μὲν ἔμεινεν ἐν ᾧ ἦν τόπῳ δύο ἡμέρας.*—*He abode two days still in the same place where he was.* R. *At that time he continued two days in the place where he was.* The *still* of A. V. does not express the idiomatic *τότε μὲν*, and might also be mistaken for *he abode quiet*, *τότε μὲν*, if the precise *two days*

had not been added, would have been *for a time*, and is therefore properly given in R.: the needless *same* of A. V. is rightly omitted.

+

Ver. 7. ἔπειτα μετὰ τῆτο λέγει τοῖς μαθηταῖς.—*Then after that saith he to his disciples.* R. *Then after this he saith to the disciples.* Little or nothing is gained here. The ἔπειτα μετὰ τῆτο is a mere pleonasm, oftener ἔπειτα μετὰ ταῦτα. τοῖς μαθ. may stand *his* just as well as *the* disciples.

=

Ver. 8. ἐζήτην.—*Sought.* R. *Were seeking.*

+

Ver. 10. ὅτι τὸ φῶς οὐκ ἔστιν ἐν αὐτῷ.—*Because there is no light in him.* R. *Because the light is not in him.* Cf. ver 9. +

Ver. 11. Λάζαρος ὁ φίλος ἡμῶν κεκοίμηται· ἀλλὰ πορεύομαι ἵνα ἐξυπνίσω αὐτόν.—*Our friend Lazarus sleepeth, but I go, that I may awaken him out of sleep.* R. *Our friend Lazarus is fallen asleep, but I go, that I may awake him out of sleep.* Rather, *Lazarus, our friend, has gone to rest; but I go that I may awake him out of sleep.* R. has caught, what A. V. slipped, the tense κεκοίμηται, which is here a perfect, though the active is continued. But to render it by fallen *asleep* leads to the mistake that it is the same, and not a totally different word from that expressed in awake out of *sleep*. This difference it is the more necessary to mark because of ver. 13, περὶ τῆς κοιμήσεως τῇ ὕπνῳ, which is correctly given, *of the taking of rest in sleep.*

— +

Ver. 12. εἰ κεκοίμηται, σωθήσεται.—*If he sleep, he shall do well.* R. *If he is fallen asleep, he shall recover.* Altering κεκοίμ. as before, σωθήσ. is better in R. For the rare use of σώζεσθαι to recover from sickness, Liddell and Scott, *Lex.*, s. v., give an example from Hippocrates.

+

Ver. 17. τέσσαρας ἡμέρας ἤδη ἔχοντα ἐν τῷ μνημείῳ.—*That he had lain in the grave four days already.* R. Also. Render, *They found him four days already in the tomb.* ἔχοντα does not require, and will scarcely bear to be rendered *had lain*; it is, as very often, with a preposition, merely a strengthened ὄντα, *ex.gr.*, Æsch., s. c. *Theb.* 99, πότ', εἰ μὴ νῦν, ἀμφὶ λιτὰν ἔχομεν; *When, if not now, shall we engage in prayer?* Μνημεῖον throughout the chapter would be better *tomb* or *sepulchre* than *grave*, which it is not. What it really is ver. 38 exactly defines.

—

Ver. 19. καὶ πολλοὶ ἐκ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐληλύθεισαν πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μάρθαν καὶ Μαρίας.—*And many of the Jews came to Martha and Mary.* R. Also, except giving correctly ἐληλ. *had come.* But what of πρὸς τὰς περὶ Μ. καὶ Μ.? Can it be that St. John employed an idiom so peculiar as οἱ ἀμφὶ or περὶ, to signify the sisters alone, *without* any companions? If Jelf, 436, d. be right, this sense was peculiar to the Attic Dial., and is frequent, therefore, in Xenophon and Plato; but where should

St. John get it? Is it not simpler to understand that many men had come to join *the women* already around the sisters, consoling them—ut flentibus adflerent. —

Ver. 20. ὥς ἤκουσεν.—*As soon as she heard.* R. *When she heard.* Immaterial; this temporal ὥς is often strong. =

Ver. 20. Μαρία δὲ ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ ἐκαθέζετο.—*Sat still in the house.* R. *Was sitting in the house.* Sat still is liable to the same objection as in ver. 6. But would not the imperf. ἐκαθ.=*continued sitting?* —

Ver. 22. ἀλλὰ καὶ νῦν, οἶδα ὅτι, ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσῃ τὸν Θεόν.—*But I know, that even now, whatsoever thou wilt ask of God.* R. *Nevertheless even now I know, that whatsoever thou shalt ask of God.* Better as regards the order of the sentence; especially better in substituting *shalt* for *wilt*. Martha's words had no reference to whether our Lord would be willing to ask anything or no, but express assurance that, ask what He might of God, God would hear him. +

Ver. 25. καὶ ἀποθάνῃ.—*Though he were dead.* R. *Though he die.* +

Ver. 26. καὶ πᾶς ὁ ζῶν καὶ πιστεύων εἰς ἐμὲ οὐ μὴ ἀποθάνῃ εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—*And whosoever liveth and believeth in me shall never die.* R. Also. Render, *Shall not die for ever*; or as it is truly expressed in our Burial Service, *shall not die eternally.* —

Ver. 27. ἐγὼ πεπίστευκα.—*I believe.* R. *I have believed.* Though of course the perf. implies that the belief remains. +

Ver. 28. ἀπῆλθε.—*She went her way.* R. *She went away.* Quite needless, and left unaltered by R. at ver. 46. —

Ver. 28. φωνεῖ σε.—*Calleth for thee.* R. *Calleth thee,* as A. V. also gives ἐφώνησε in this same verse. +

Ver. 29. ἐγείρεται.—*Arose.* R. *Ariseth.* +

Ver. 30. οὐπω δὲ ἐληλύθει.—*Was not yet come.* R. Also. Why not *had not come*, as corrected at ver. 19? —

Ver. 31. καὶ παραμυθέμενοι.—*And comforted her.* R. *And were comforting her.* Rather omit *were* because of the previous οἱ ὄντες μετ' αὐτῆς, *who were with her.* —

Ver. 31. ὅτι ταχέως ἀνέστη καὶ ἐξῆλθεν.—*That she rose up hastily and went out.* R. Also. Is it not rather, *That in haste she rose up and went out*; throwing ἀν. καὶ ἐξ. together as one combined and sudden act, ver. 29, is rightly translated, *arisseth quickly and cometh* (rather *goeth*), but there the position of ταχὺ=ταχέως is altered: it is ἐγείρεται ταχὺ καὶ ἔρχεται, the latter act following upon the former. For ἔρχεται=*goeth.* Cf. Wunder Soph. Philoct. 48. —

Ver. 33. ὑπεβριμήσατο τῷ πνεύματι καὶ ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτὸν.—*He groaned in the spirit, and was troubled*—with marginal, *he*

troubled himself. R. *Was greatly moved in his spirit, and troubled himself.* On the rare ἐνεβρ. little certain can be determined; whether it was inward or expressed emotion, τῷ πν. = *his spirit*, clearly; so Scholef. ap. Middleton in loc. =

Ver. 37. ποιῆσαι ἵνα καὶ οὗτος μὴ ἀποθάνῃ.—*Have caused that even this man should not have died.* R. *Have caused also that this man should not have died..* But καὶ surely belongs to οὗτος.

Ver. 38. ἦν δὲ σπήλαιον, καὶ λίθος ἐπέκειτο ἐπ' αὐτῷ.—*It was a cave, and a stone lay upon it.* R. *Now it was a cave, and a stone lay against it.* Better, *Was laid over against it.* Yet even this scarcely expresses the double ἐπὶ. There seems no great reason for avoiding the sense of *upon* for ἐπὶ, which appears to have influenced R. If there be not, then ἄρατε and ἦραν, in the subsequent verses, may bear their usual meaning to *take up*.

Ver. 39. τεταρταῖος γάρ ἐστι.—*For he hath been dead four days.* R. Also. Both marking that *dead* is supplied. Τεταρτ. agrees with νεκρὸς understood, and may almost be rendered *for now he is the fourth day a corpse*; most readers will remember Xen. *Anab.* vi. 2, 9, ἤδη γὰρ ἦσαν πεμπταῖοι, καὶ οὐχ οἷόν τε ἀναιρεῖν ἐπὶ ἦν. Cf. et Her. 2. 89, where τριταῖαι ἢ τεταρταῖαι γυναῖκες occurs exactly as τεταρταῖος in St. John.

Ver. 40. ὅτι ἐὰν πιστεύσης.—*That, if thou wouldest believe.* R. *If thou believe.* This construction of ὅτι the translators were not, perhaps, likely to observe. Cf. Jelf, 802. +

Ver. 41. οὗ ἦν ὁ τεθνηκὼς κείμενος.—*Where the dead was laid.* R. Also. To render ὁ τεθν. *the deceased*, would be too modern a phrase, though that is its meaning. The combination of the two participles τεθν. and κείμ. is very difficult to express.

Ver. 41. ἦρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς ἄνω.—*Lifted up his eyes.* R. *Lifted his eyes upward.* The turn of expression is similar to Hor., *cœlo supinas si tuleris manus*, where *tuleris*=*sustuleris*, and is strengthened by *supinas*, just as ἄνω gives its force to ἦρε. +

Ver. 42. ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὄχλον τὸν περιεστῶτα εἶπον.—*But because of the people which stand by, I said it.* R. *But for the sake of the multitude which stand around, I said it.* +

Ver. 43. φωνῇ μεγάλῃ ἐκραύγασε.—*He cried with a loud voice.* R. *He cried out with a loud voice.* Right on the same principle as ver. 41. +

Ver. 44. ἐξῆλθεν ὁ τεθνηκὼς.—*He that was dead came forth.* R. Also. So almost in English, but how different in Greek—ὅς ἐγένετο νεκρὸς καὶ ἔζησεν, Rev. ii. 8, *which was dead, and is alive.*

Ver. 44. δεδεμένος—περιεδέδετο.—*Bound—was bound about.*
R. Also. Forgetting the perf. and pluperf. Upon the fact recorded in this verse see a note of Bp. Pearson, fol. p. 220, 221.

Ver. 45. οἱ ἐλθόντες . . . καὶ θεασάμενοι.—*Which came and had seen.* R. *Which had come and seen.* Read, *Which came and saw.*

Ver. 47. τί ποιῶμεν.—*What do we?* R. *What are we to do?*
Is it not rather—*What are we doing?*

Ver. 49. εἷς δέ τις ἐξ αὐτῶν, Καϊάφας, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν τῇ ἐνιαυτῇ ἐκεῖνῃ.—*And one of them, named Caiaphas, being the high priest that same year.* R. *And a certain one of them, named Caiaphas, being high priest that year.* On the peculiar εἷς τις, see Ellendt. *Lex. Soph.*, p. 527. For the omission of *named*, see ver. 1. 'Αρχιερεὺς ὢν is an instance in point for the construction of ὢν spoken of, ix. 25. The meaning of the verse is this—*And a certain one of them*, where the indefinite τις has, in reality, a particular definitiveness, *to wit, Caiaphas, inasmuch as he was, or as being high priest, said to them, etc.*; ἀρχ. not ὁ ἀρχ., therefore not *the* high priest; the absence of the article being itself emphatic. So that the two words, ἀρχιερεὺς ὢν, in fact, express all that is expressed in ver. 51, namely, that *because* he was high priest he uttered unconscious prophecy.

Ver. 50. οὐδὲ διαλογίζεσθε.—*Nor consider.* R. *Nor do ye consider.* Needed to complete the sense.

Ver. 51. ὑπὲρ τῇ ἔθνους.—*For that nation.* R. *For the nation.* So Scholefield.

Ver. 52. τὰ διεσκορπισμένα.—*That were scattered abroad.*
R. *That are scattered abroad.* Why not, *that have been scattered abroad?*

Ver. 54. κακεῖ διέτριβε.—*There continued.* R. *There tarried.*
Better word, as it is διέτριβε, and not ἔμεινεν, but it is the imperfect tense.

Ver. 54. εἰς Ἐφραῖμ λ. π.—*Into.* R. *To.*

CHAPTER XII.

Ver. 1. ὅπου ἦν Λάζαρος, ὁ τεθνηκὼς.—*Where Lazarus was which had been dead.* R. Also. This, awkward in itself, becomes more so when compared with the last chapter, where the same ὁ τεθνηκὼς is rendered *the dead*. May it not be considered merely as in apposition to Lazarus, and rendered with its true meaning, *he that was lately dead*, just as τέθνηκε Φίλιππος; is the λέγεται τι καινὸν;

Ver. 2. ἐποίησαν οὖν αὐτῷ δεῖπνον ἐκεῖ.—*There they made him a supper.* R. *So they made him a supper there.* +

Ver. 2. εἷς ἦν τῶν ἀνακειμένων σὺν αὐτῷ.—*Was one of them that sat at the table with him.* R. Also. There is no objection to leaving this unaltered, except that R. has altered it in the next chapter, ver. 23. —

Ver. 3. μύρου νάρδου πιστικῆς.—*Ointment of spikenard.* R. *Ointment of pure spikenard.* In margin *liquid.* Better *pure.* Cf. Liddell and Scott, from πίστις, like the English word *reliable.* +

Ver. 4. ὁ μέλλων παραδιδόναι.—*Which should betray him.* R. *Which was about to betray him.* Why not, *He that was about to betray him?* —

Ver. 6. εἶπε δὲ τῆτο, οὐχ ὅτι περὶ τῶν πτωχῶν ἔμελεν αὐτῷ.—*This he said, not that he cared for the poor.* R. Also. Is it not rather, *But he said this, not because he cared about the poor, but because, &c.* —

Ver. 6. τὸ γλωσσόκομον εἶχε, καὶ τὰ βαλλόμενα ἐβάσταζεν.—*Had the bag, and bare what was put therein.* R. *Kept the bag, and purloined what was put therein.* The change in εἶχε is needless, but of little moment. For the rendering ἐβάσταζεν *purloined* many great names can be given, but can one good instance be produced for such an interpretation from classical or from Scripture Greek? St. John himself is quoted as so using the word, xx. 15; but that is not the fact, εἰ σὺ ἐβάστασας αὐτὸν=*If you have borne him hence*, but the expletive *hence*, needed to complete the sense, forms no part of ἐβάστασας, in which the idea of *carrying* alone is involved. This is, indeed, the prevailing, almost the universal notion of the word; so much so, that it is found continually with the adjunct *χερὶ*. To say that *ferre* is so used for *auferre* says nothing to the purpose; that is merely the simple in the sense of the compound verb: *bast.* is much more akin to *portare* than to *ferre*. If to *purloin* be the true, it must be admitted to be a recondite sense of the word, and therefore might fairly be expected in poetry rather than prose. But it will be looked for in vain, whether in Homer, Pindar, or the Tragedians, though with these last it is a very common word. In Greek prose it is scarcely to be found at all. Liddell and Scott give Polybius=*to carry off*. The sense of *purloining* is said to be necessary in St. John, because Judas is first called κλέπτης. May it not just as well be said that, as bearer of the bag and its contents, he had opportunity and incentive to become κλέπτης? —

Ver. 8. τοὺς πτωχοὺς γὰρ πάντοτε ἔχετε μεθ' ἐαυτῶν.—*For the poor always ye have with you.* R. *For the poor ye have always with you.* Merely throws the πάντ. more strictly to ἔχ. =

Ver. 9. οὐ διὰ τὸν Ἰησοῦν μόνον.—*Not for Jesus' sake only.* R. *Not because of Jesus only.* The A. V. might lead into mistake. +

Ver. 10. ἐβελεύσαντο.—*Consulted.* R. *Took counsel.* But this might mean that they *took counsel* of others, and not among themselves. —

Ver. 12. ἀκέσαντες.—*When they heard.* R. *Having heard.* At least let it be *upon hearing*; but the A. V. marks the aor., and, what is more, catches the change from the singular noun of number ὄχλος, joined with ὁ ἐλθὼν, to the plural ἀκέσαντες. This should surely not be lost. —

Ver. 13. τὰ βῆλα τῶν φοινίκων.—*Branches of palm trees.* R. *Branches of the palm trees.* It is noticeable that St. John so definitely marks the trees; the two first evangelists have it generally τῶν δένδρων, and St. Luke makes no mention of branches at all. +

Ver. 13. εὐλογημένος ὁ ἐρχόμενος ἐν ὀνόματι Κυρίου, ὁ βασιλεὺς τῇ Ἰσραήλ.—*Blessed is the king of Israel that cometh in the name of the Lord.* R. *Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord, the king of Israel.* A decided improvement, requiring only a (,) after Κυρίου. +

Ver. 14. εὗρὼν δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὄναριον.—*When he had found.* R. *Having found.* Clearly, *After finding*=*nactus*. Our Lord, we shall remember from Matt. xxi., had sent two disciples to find the ass and her colt. —

Ver. 18. ὑπήντησαν.—*Met him.* R. *Went to meet him.* As A. V. xi. 20. +

Ver. 20. ἐκ τῶν ἀναβαινόντων.—*Among them that went up.* R. *Among those.* From A. V., the certain Greeks might have been among the Pharisees, ver. 19. +

Ver. 21. ἠρώτων.—*Desired him.* R. *Prayed him.* Surely too strong. Upon the use of the word ἐρωτάω as compared with αἰτέω in N. T., see Trench, *Syn.*, pp. 164—8. —

Ver. 24. αὐτὸς μόνος μένει.—*It abideth alone.* R. *It abideth by itself alone.* Cf. vi. 15. +

Ver. 29. ἄγγελος αὐτῷ λελάληκεν.—*An angel spake to him.* R. *An angel hath spoken to him.* +

Ver. 30. οὐ δι' ἐμέ ἀλλὰ δι' ὑμᾶς.—*Not because of me, but for your sakes.* R. *Not for my sake, but for your sakes.* +

Ver. 33. ποίῳ θανάτῳ ἤμελλεν ἀποθνήσκειν.—*What death he should die.* R. *What manner of death he should die.* Read, *By what kind of death he was about to die.* Ποίῳ, as in R., should clearly be expressed, since in it lies the force of ὑψωθῶ. It would be very bold to say *die hanging*, when *die by hanging*

was meant. In ver. 4, R. corrects *μ. παραδ.* from *should betray* into *was about to betray*. —

Ver. 35. *καὶ ὁ περιπατῶν ἐν τῇ σκοτίᾳ οὐκ οἶδε πῆ ὑπάγει.*—*For he that walketh in darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.* R. *And he that walketh in the darkness knoweth not whither he goeth.* This is right, and seems rather to confirm R., ch. viii. 12; see also 1 John ii. 8—11. The same figurative language occurs, Xen., *Anab.*, ii., 5, 9, *ἀνευ δὲ σῆ πάσα μὲν διὰ σκοτὺς ἡ ὁδός· ἐδὲν γὰρ αὐτῆς ἐπιστάμεθα.* +

Ver. 36. *ἵνα υἱοὶ φωτὸς γένησθε.*—*That ye may be the children of light.* R. *That ye may become sons of light.* So R. should have rendered *γενήσεσθε*, viii. 33. +

Ver. 36. *καὶ ἀπελθὼν ἐκρύβη ἀπ' αὐτῶν.*—*And departed, and did hide himself from them.* R. *And he departed, and did hide himself from them.* *Ἐκρύβη* may certainly be used in a middle sense. Jelf, 369, 2, gives the kindred *ἀπαλλαγῆναι*, to *remove oneself*. But there seems no reason why *ἐκρύβη* here, and viii. 59, should not be construed simply as passive. Why not say, *and departing he was hidden from them?* —

Ver. 41. *ὅτε εἶδε τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆ, καὶ ἐλάλησε περὶ αὐτῆ.*—*When he saw his glory, and spake of him.* R. *When he saw his glory; and he spake of him.* This is merely a question of punctuation, but is it an improvement? Upon this whole passage, from ver. 36, Bishop Pearson has written, as only he can write. —

Ver. 42. *ὁμῶς μέντοι καὶ ἐκ τῶν ἀρχόντων πολλοὶ ἐπίστευσαν εἰς αὐτὸν.*—*Nevertheless, among the chief rulers also, many believed on him.* R. *Nevertheless, even of the rulers, many believed in him.* The strangeness lay in any of the high ones of the nation believing. +

Ver. 42. *ἀλλὰ, διὰ τὰς Φαρισαίους, οὐχ ὁμολόγησεν.*—*But because of the Pharisees they did not confess him.* R. *But because of the Pharisees they did not confess it.* Is it not simpler to understand *αὐτὸν*, rather than *πίστιν*? Compare ix. 22. —

Ver. 43. *ἠγάπησαν γὰρ τὴν δόξαν τῶν ἀνθρώπων μᾶλλον ἢπερ τὴν δόξαν τῆ Θεῶ.*—*For they loved the praise of men more than the praise of God.* R. *For they loved the glory [that is] of men more than the glory [that is] of God.* To say the least this looks awkward, and is not very intelligible. *Δόξα* of course is rather *glory* than *praise*=*ἔπαινος*, Cf. Rom. ii. 29, *Ὁ ἔπαινος οὐκ ἐξ ἀνθρώπων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῆ Θεῶ.* St. John is here, after all, but repeating in another form what our Lord had said, chap. v. 44. —

Ver. 48. *τά ῥήματά μου.*—*My words.* R. Also.

Ver. 48. *ὁ λόγος ὃν ἐλάλησα.*—*The word which I have spoken.* R. *The word that I spake.* This last is right of course; but do

words and *word* correctly give the different ῥήματα and λόγος? Here they occur together in one verse, as after the interval of a verse, x. 19—21; they should surely be distinguished. —

Ver. 49. ὅτι ἐξ ἐμαυτῆς οὐκ ἐλάλησα.—*For I have not spoken of myself.* R. *Because I spake not of myself.* +

Ver. 49. αὐτός μοι ἐντολήν ἔδωκε.—*He gave me a commandment.* R. *He gave me commandment.* Yet xi. 57, R. leaves it a *commandment*. Should it not here stand, *Because I spake not of myself; but the Father which sent me, himself gave me a commandment, which I should say, and what I should speak?* Here we have εἶπω joined with λαλήσω, as ῥήματα with λόγος in the last verse. When, as in x. 18, there is reference to a specific power in the hands of Christ, namely, that over his own life, to lay it down and to take it again, then the similar expression is put more definitely; it is ταύτην τὴν ἐντολήν ἔλαβον παρὰ τῷ Πατρί μου. —

Ver. 50. καθὼς εἶρηκέ μοι ὁ Πατήρ.—*Even as the Father said unto me.* R. *Even as the Father hath said unto me.* +

CHAPTER XIII.

Ver. 1. εἰδὼς ὁ Ἰησοῦς.—*When Jesus knew.* R. *Jesus knowing.* +

Ver. 2. καὶ δείπνῃ γενομένῃ.—*And supper being ended.* R. *And when supper was begun.* A. V. clearly is wrong, but is R. in the other extreme right? Δ. γεν. seems to be neither *cæna peracta* as with some, nor *cæna parata* as with others; but simply *incidente cæn*=*a supper taking place*, or even *when a supper took place*, if the aor. γεν. be insisted upon; γενομένῃ is here almost ὄντος. Thus the same fact in Matt. xxvi. 6, Ἰησοῦς γενομένῃ ἐν οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος, is Mark xiv. 3, ὄντος αὐτῆς ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ Σίμωνος. The reason given by some for not rendering ver. 2 *supper being ended*, is really no reason at all; it is drawn from ver. 4, ἐγείρεται ἐκ τῆς δείπνῃς=he riseth from the supper; therefore the supper is not ended, is the inference. But there can be no objection, so far as the words go, to render εγ. ἐκ τ. δείπν., he riseth *after* the supper, Cf. Eur., *Hec.*, 903; ἐκ δείπνων ὕπνος ἡδύς, as quoted for this very sense, Jelf, 621. So that ver. 4 might as well be urged for, as against the A. V. in ver. 2, though there can be little doubt but it incorrectly renders γεν. *ended*. This only shews how it may be possible to come to right conclusions even upon wrong premises.

Ver. 2. ἤδη βεβληκότος.—*Having now put.* R. *Having already put.* +

Ver. 3. ὅτι ἀπὸ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθε, καὶ πρὸς τὸν Θεὸν ὑπάγει.—*That he was come from God, and went to God.* R. *That he came forth from God, and was going to God.* +

Ver. 4. ἐγείρεται ἐκ τῆ δείπνου, καὶ τίθησι τὰ ἱμάτια.—*He riseth from supper, and laid aside his garments.* R. *Riseth from the supper, and layeth aside his garments.* +

Ver. 5. εἰς τὸν νυπτῆρα.—*Into a bason.* R. *Into the bason.* See Middleton *in loc.* +

Ver. 6. ἔρχεται οὖν πρὸς Σίμωνα Πέτρον.—*Then he cometh to Simon Peter.* R. *So he cometh to Simon Peter.* Is it intended by this to meet the needless question, whether or no our Lord went first to Peter? =

Ver. 7. ὃ ἐγὼ ποιῶ σὺ οὐκ οἶδας ἄρτι, γνώσῃ δὲ μετὰ ταῦτα.—*What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter.* R. Also, with the necessary correction of *afterwards*, for *hereafter*. It is Scholefield's correction also. Μετὰ ταῦτα here might almost be expressed *after these things*, for it is fulfilled, ver. 12. *What I am doing* would give a more present force to ὃ ποιῶ. +

Ver. 8. οὐ μὴ νύψῃς τὰς πόδας μου εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.—*Thou shalt never wash my feet.* R. *Never shalt thou wash my feet.* The rendering is strengthened so, however short it falls of the original, which it is hardly possible to give fully. This verse might seem to be opposed to the remark made at xi. 26, but it is not. There, as at iv. 14, our Lord is deliberately propounding vital truth; here Peter is giving utterance to vehement and overstrained language. Something of the same hyperbole, if we may say so, St. Paul has, 1 Cor. viii. 13, οὐ μὴ φάγω κρέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. +

Ver. 10. ὁ λελαμένος.—*He that is washed.* R. *He that hath been bathed.* Though *bathed* is hardly the word that would have been chosen, if there was any choice; it is quite necessary to distinguish λούω from νίπτω. In Heb. x. 22, *washed* can be retained, because it is fully expressed, λελαμένοι τὸ σῶμα. Upon St. John, see Trench, *Synon.*, p. 185. +

Ver. 10. ἀλλ' οὐχὶ πάντες.—*But not all.* R. *Yet not all.* =

Ver. 11. ᾔδει γὰρ τὸν παραδιδόντα αὐτόν.—*For he knew who should betray him.* R. *For he knew him that should betray him.* Render, *For he knew him that was betraying him.* Ver. 2, Satan had already entered into the heart of Iscariot. For this force of the present, see Jelf, 398, 2. —

Ver. 15.—ὑπόδειγμα γὰρ ἔδωκα ὑμῖν, ἵνα καθὼς ἐγὼ ἐποίησα ὑμῖν, καὶ ὑμεῖς ποιήτε.—*For I have given you an example, that ye should do as I have done to you.* R. *For I have given you an example, that ye also should do as I have done to you.* Render,

For I gave you an example, that even as I did to you, you should also do. Ἔδωκα, *I gave you*, that is, in the act just done, commenced ver. 4, explained ver. 12, and now practically applied ver. 15—17. R. has forgotten its own rule, Pref. vii, and properly carried out chap. xvii. 2, where ἔδωκας, followed by δέδωκας, stands *gavest*, and *hast given*, in R. —

Ver. 16. οὐκ ἔστι δᾶλος μείζων τῷ κυρίῳ αὐτοῦ.—*The servant is not greater than his lord.* R. *There is no servant greater than his lord.* Rather, *A servant is not greater than his lord.* This is, first, a general, almost a proverbial saying; with its more definite repetition in οὐδὲ ἀπόστολος, therefore it is οὐδὲ, and not οὔτε; and then its personal application to the disciples themselves, in εἰ ταῦτα οἴδατε. —

Ver. 16. ἐδὲ ἀπόστολος μείζων τῷ πέμψαντος αὐτόν.—*Neither he that is sent greater than he that sent him.* R. *Nor an apostle greater than he that sent him.* Better, not only as giving us St. John's first, and *only*, use of the express word, ἀπόστολος; better also, because though ἀπόστολος=ὁ ἀποσταλμένος, the A. V. would lead us to suppose that it was followed, not by πέμψαντος, but by ἀποστείλαντος. +

Ver. 17. μακάριοί ἐστε.—*Happy are ye.* R. *Blessed are ye*, as A. V. xx. 29, where alone St. John uses the word again. It may add somewhat to the force and sanctity of this word to remember, that, in the Gospels, it falls from our Lord's own lips, except only in two instances, Luke i. 48; xi. 27; both of which refer to his miraculous conception. +

Ver. 18. ὁ τρώγων μετ' ἐμοῦ τὸν ἄρτον.—*He that eateth bread with me.* R. Also. But has not the article here a peculiar, almost a mystical meaning? In Ps. xli. 9, it is ἄρτος μου. So τὸν ἄρτον is *my* bread, but in an infinitely higher sense when referred to the Eucharist, of which this supper was surely a foreshadowing. It is remarkable, that John alone of the evangelists so refers to this fulfilment of prophecy. —

Ver. 19. ἀπ' ἄρτι.—*Now.* R. *From henceforth*, as A. V. in margin, and xiv. 7, in the text. Perhaps here, ἀπ' ἄρτι, or rather, ἀπάρτι λέγω=*I tell you at once.* +

Ver. 22. ἀπορούμενοι περὶ τίνος.—*Doubting of whom.* R. *Being in doubt about whom.* Is not ἀπορ. stronger than this=*being at a loss*, or, *in perplexity about.* —

Ver. 23. ἦν ἑνὰ κείμενος.—*There was leaning.* R. *There was reclining at meat.* The peculiar ἀνάκειμαι=*accumbere*, has no one English equivalent. +

Ver. 23. ἀναπεσὼν ἐπὶ.—*Lying on.* R. *Leaning back on.* A. V. misses this other peculiar word with reference to meals.

Ver. 24. νεύει ἐν . . . πυθέσθαι.—*Beckoned to him, that he*

should ask. R. *Beckoneth to him, to ask.* Right as to the infin. *πυθ.*, but is not *νεύει* rather *signs to him*? It was more likely by a look, than by the finger, that the intimation was given; *νεύει* is only used again, Acts xxiv. 10; *νεύσαντος αὐτῷ τῇ ἡγεμόνος λέγειν.* whereas Acts xix. 33, it is *κατασείσας τὴν χεῖρα.* +

Ver. 26. *ἐκεῖνός ἐστιν ᾧ ἐγὼ βάψας τὸ ψωμίον, ἐπιδώσω. Καὶ ἐμβάψας τὸ ψωμίον, δίδωσιν Ἰῆδᾰ Σίμωνος Ἰσκαριώτῃ.*—*He it is, to whom I shall give a sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the sop, he gave it to Judas Iscariot, the son of Simon.* R. *He it is, to whom I shall give the sop, when I have dipped it. And dipping the sop, he giveth it to Judas Iscariot the son of Simon.* How inefficient any translation must be to give clearly the *βάψας* and *ἐμβάψας*; *ἐπιδώσω* and *δίδωσιν*; or even the strange word *ψωμίον*. A. V. in margin gives *morsel*. The word is only found in St. John; *ψωμός*, of which it is the diminutive, is frequent in Septuagint; found also in *Odys.* = *frusta*. =

Ver. 27. *καὶ μετὰ τὸ ψωμίον τότε.*—*And after the sop.* R. *And after the sop straightway.* +

Ver. 37. *ὑπὲρ σοῦ.*—*For thy sake.* R. *For thee.* Quite unnecessary; the sense of *for the sake of*, surely lies in *ὑπὲρ* alone. —

CHAPTER XIV.

Ver. 1. *πιστεύετε εἰς τὸν Θεόν, καὶ εἰς ἐμὲ πιστεύετε.*—*Ye believe in God, believe also in me.* R. *Believe in God, believe also in me.* With, in margin, or *ye believe*. Much the same question was raised, chap. v. 39, as to *ἐρευνᾶτε*, but with greater reason there than here. —

Ver. 3. *πάλιν ἔρχομαι καὶ παραλήψομαι.*—*I will come again and receive.* R. *I will come again and will receive.* Not a needless addition of *will*, having regard to the different tenses *ἔρχ.* and *παραλήψ.*, the one a present with future sense, the other a distinct future. +

Ver. 7. *εἰ ἐγνώκειτέ με, καὶ τὸν Πατέρα μου ἐγνώκειτε ἄν.*—*If ye had known me, ye should have known.* R. *If ye knew me, ye would have known.* So also *ἔγνωκας*, ver. 9. +

Ver. 12. *μείζονα τέτων ποιήσει.*—*Greater works than these shall he do.* *Works* in italics. R. *Greater things than these.* Both *ἔργα* & *ποιῶ* before and *τέτων* rightly suggest *ἔργα* as understood with *μείζονα*. —

Ver. 18. *ὀρφανές.*—*Comfortless*, with *orphans* in margin. R. *Orphans*, which yields a stronger and better force to the word, not used again N. T. except literally, Jas. i. 27. = +

Ver. 22. *λέγει αὐτῷ Ἰῆδᾰς (οὐχ ὁ Ἰσκαριώτης).*—*Judas saith*

unto him, not Iscariot. R. Judas, not Iscariot, saith unto him. The order of the words disturbed, and their effect weakened. —

Ver. 23. τὸν λόγον μὲ τηρήσει.—*He will keep my words.* R. *He will keep my word.* But in following verse, τὰς λόγους is incorrectly left *sayings*, though ὁ λόγος, *the word*, comes directly afterwards. See x. 19. +

Ver. 25. παρ' ὑμῖν μένων.—*Being yet present with you.* R. *While yet abiding with you.* If the *while yet* be needful? =

Ver. 26. ὁ δὲ Παράκλητος, τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον.—*But the Comforter, which is the Holy Ghost.* R. *But the Comforter, even the Holy Ghost.* Why supply anything? In the Te Deum to add in *even* would sadly mar the distinct—*Also the Holy Ghost, the Comforter.* —

Ver. 26. πάντα ἃ εἶπον ὑμῖν.—*Whatsoever I have said unto you.* R. *All things which I spake unto you.* +

Ver. 28. ἐχάρητε ἂν ὅτι εἶπον πορεύομαι.—*Ye would rejoice, because I said, I go.* R. *Ye would have rejoiced that I go,* omitting εἶπον. Perhaps πορ. rather should be rendered *I am going.* +

Ver. 30. οὐκ ἔτι πολλὰ λαλήσω μεθ' ὑμῶν.—*Hereafter I will not talk much with you.* R. *I will no more talk much with you.* +

Ver. 30. ὁ τῷ κόσμῳ τέττε ἄρχων.—*The prince of this world.* R. *The prince of the world,* omitting τέττε. But this is a term peculiar to St. John, and used twice again, xii. 31; xvi. 11. See note of Bishop Pearson, p. 42, fol. —

CHAPTER XV.

Ver. 2. καθαίρει αὐτὸ, ἵνα πλείονα καρπὸν φέρῃ.—*He purgeth it, that it may bring forth more fruit.* R. *He cleanseth, that it may bear more fruit.* Καθ., *cleanseth*, better in itself, and connecting better with καθαροί ἐστε. The αὐτὸ is redundant, and may therefore be omitted in translation. Φέρῃ—*may bear*, uniformly with the rest. Καθαίρει is here in an unusual sense; it is only found once again in N. T., and there of legal purification, Heb. x. 2. +

Ver. 3. ἤδη ὑμεῖς καθαροί ἐστε διὰ τὸν λόγον.—*Now ye are clean through the word.* R. *Ye are clean already by reason of the word.* Or even, *already ye are clean.* +

Ver. 4. ἔτι οὐδὲ ὑμεῖς.—*No more can ye.* R. *So neither can ye.* +

Ver. 5. ὅτι χωρὶς ἐμῆ.—*For without me.* R. *Because without me.* But it is χωρὶς, not ἄνευ. The margin in A. V., *severed from*, is perhaps too strong; but at least it should be *apart from*,

especially as our Lord is speaking of the necessity of the disciples' union with Himself. The difference between χωρὶς and ἄνευ, is best seen from CEd. Tyr., 1550-1.

Αἶν οὐ ποθ' ἡ 'μὴ χωρὶς ἐστάθη βορᾶς
Τράπεζ' ἄνευ τῆδ' ἀνδρός.

Ver. 6. ἐβλήθη ἔξω ὡς τὸ κλῆμα.—*Is cast forth as a branch.* R. Also. This sentence is in many ways noticeable: ἐβλ. the aor. for a present, Jelf, 401, 402. The article τὸ dormant, as explained in preface, p. xii, or as Middleton, xii. 24, calls it the *hypothetical* use; and κλῆμα, itself a peculiar word, not used in N. T. except in this chapter. Trench, *Syn.*, p. 206, marks its distinction from κλάδος.

Ver. 6. καὶ συνάγουσι αὐτὰ καὶ εἰς τὸ πῦρ βάλλουσι, καὶ καίεται.—*And men gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they are burned.* R. *And they gather them, and cast them into the fire, and they burn.* In what respect can *they* be better than the indefinite *men*, to which, after all, it must refer? To render καίεται *burn* for *are burned*, is no more necessary than the alteration in καίόμενος, ch. v. 35.

Ver. 7. αἰτήσεσθε.—*Ye shall ask.* R. *Ask.* Adopting αἰτεῖσθε.

Ver. 8. καὶ γενήσεσθε ἐμοὶ μαθηταί.—*So shall ye be my disciples.* R. *So shall ye become my disciples.* Cf. viii. 33.

Ver. 11. ἵνα ἡ χαρὰ ἡ ἐμὴ ἐν ὑμῖν μένῃ.—*That my joy might remain in you.* R. *That my joy may abide in you.* It is quite right to translate μένειν uniformly. But did not our Lord mean to say here, *That my joy in you may remain*?

Ver. 15. οὐκέτι ὑμᾶς λέγω δέσους.—*Henceforth I call you not servants.* R. *No longer do I call you servants.* Cf. xiv. 30.

Ver. 15. ὑμᾶς δὲ εἶρηκα φίλους.—*But I have called you friends.* R. Also. Making no distinction between λέγω and εἶρηκα = *But I have spoken of you as friends.* Cf. Eur., *Suppl.*, 355, τί μ' ἐρῶσιν.

Ver. 15. ὅτι πάντα, ἃ ἤκουσα παρὰ τοῦ Πατρὸς μου, ἐγνώρισα ὑμῖν.—*For all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you.* R. *Because I have made known unto you all things that I heard from my Father.* Thus the simple order of the word is involved, and R., marking aor. ἤκουσα, lets slip ἐγνώρισα, which is not *I have made known*, but *I made known*, as ἤκουσα = *I heard*.

Ver. 16. οὐχ ὑμεῖς με ἐξελέξασθε.—*Ye have not chosen me.* R. *Ye did not choose me.* Render, *Ye chose not me, but I chose you.*

Ver. 16. καὶ ἔθηκα ὑμᾶς.—*And ordained you.* R. *And ap-*

pointed you. Not of any moment, but Cf. 1 Tim. ii. 7 ; 2 Tim. i. 11. —

Ver. 16. ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε.—*Whatsoever ye shall ask.* R. *Whatsoever ye ask.* +

Ver. 18. γινώσκετε.—*Ye know.* R. *Know,* with *ye know* in the margin. =

Ver. 20. οὐκ ἔστι δούλος μείζων τοῦ κυρίου αὐτοῦ.—*The servant is not greater than his lord.* R. *There is no servant greater than his lord,* see xii. 16. —

Ver. 20. εἰ ἐδίωξαν . . . εἰ ἐτήρησαν.—*If they have persecuted . . . if they have kept.* R. *If they persecuted . . . if they kept.* +

Ver. 22. ἁμαρτίαν οὐκ εἶχον.—*They had not had sin.* R. *They would not have sin.* +

Ver. 22. πρόφασιν.—*Cloke,* in margin *excuse.* R. *Excuse.* =

Ver. 27. καὶ ὑμεῖς δὲ μαρτυρεῖτε.—*And ye also shall bear witness.* R. *And ye also are witnesses.* Why not, *And ye also bear witness?* R. renders as if it was, what it is Luke xxiv. 48, ὑμεῖς δὲ ἐστε μάρτυρες = Π., iii. 302., ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες—μάρτυροι. How would either of these bear conversely to be rendered as if μαρτυρεῖτε? —

CHAPTER XVI.

Ver. 2. ἔρχεται ὥρα.—*The time cometh.* R. *An hour cometh.* Rather, *An hour is coming.* —

Ver. 2. πᾶς ὁ ἀποκτείνας.—*Whosoever killeth.* R. *Every man that killeth.* Read, *Every one that killeth.* On the contrary, just as needlessly v. 22, εἰς, *no man,* is in R. *no one.* —

Ver. 2. δόξη λατρεῖαν προσφέρειν τῷ Θεῷ.—*Will think that he doeth God service.* R. *Will think that he is offering a service unto God.* The peculiar word λατρεία is by Plato also used for religious service; St. John alone of the evangelists uses it, and only in this place. St. Paul has it three times, his expression, παραστήσαι λατρεῖαν, Rom. xii. 1, agrees with this προσφ. λατρ. +

Ver. 4. λελάληκα . . . εἶπον . . . εἶπον.—*Told . . . told . . . said.* R. *Spoken . . . told . . . told.* *Eadem iisdem* is better. +

Ver. 7. ἀπέλθω . . . πορευθῶ.—*Go away . . . depart.* R. *Depart . . . go.* Both are to be distinguished from the familiar word ὑπάγω, which, so continually used by three of the evangelists, is found only once in St. Luke, and not once in the Acts or St. Paul's Epistles; and which so very often involves, indirectly, stealth or secrecy, or, in the case of our Lord, mystery in the going away. +

Ver. 8. ἐλέγξει τὸν κόσμον περὶ ἁμαρτίας.—*He will reprove the world of sin* (margin, *convince*). R. *Convict in respect of*

sin. All these three senses belong equally to ἐλέγχω; the fitting one can only be determined by the context. Would, for instance, *convict*, which suits so well περὶ ἁμαρτ., suit as well either περὶ δικαί. or περὶ κρισ.? If, again, περὶ=*in respect of*, is the first case, it should be repeated also in the two following.—

Ver. 11. κέκριται.—*Is judged.* R. *Hath been judged.* And yet R., at iii. 18, renders κέκριται, *is judged.* The fact is that κέκριται, like γέγραπται, is used for the completed action continuing in its effect. See Jelf, 399 b. —

Ver. 12. ἀλλ' οὐ δύνασθε βαστάζειν ἄρτι.—*But ye cannot bear them now.* R. Also. More strongly, if more literally, *But ye are not able to bear them now.* R. do not think of *purloin* for βαστάζειν here. —

Ver 13. ὁδηγήσει.—*He will guide.* R. *Shall.* As all the other futures in this and the next verse are expressed. +

Ver. 13. εἰς πᾶσαν τὴν ἀλήθειαν.—*Into all truth.* R. *Into all the truth.* As Middleton here, and Mark v. 33. +

Ver. 13. τὰ ἐρχόμενα ἀναγγελεῖ ὑμῖν.—*He will shew you things to come.* R. *He will tell you the things to come.* In like manner the woman of Samaria, iv. 25, says of the Messias, ὅταν ἔλθῃ ἐκεῖνος, ἀναγγελεῖ ἡμῖν πάντα, where A. V. has, *correctly, tell.* +

Ver. 17. οὐ θεωρεῖτέ με . . . ὄψεσθέ με.—*Ye shall not see me. . . ye shall see me.* R. *Ye behold me not . . . ye shall see me.* +

Ver. 18. λέγει . . . λαλεῖ.—*He saith . . . he saith.* R. *He saith . . . he speaketh.* +

Ver. 21. διὰ τὴν χαρὰν.—*For joy.* R. *For her joy,* or rather, *by reason of her joy.* Τὸ παιδίον even might better be *her child.* +

Ver. 22. καὶ ὑμεῖς οὖν λύπην μὲν νῦν ἔχετε· πάλιν δὲ ὄψομαι ὑμᾶς.—*And ye now therefore have sorrow.* R. *So ye also now have sorrow.* Though this hardly gives the four particles. Perhaps they come best in their own order, *And ye accordingly have sorrow indeed now; but I will see you again.* The καὶ ἔν are thrown back upon the last verse, and νῦν μὲν answer to πάλιν δὲ, and λύπην ἔχετε to χαρήσεται καρδία. —

Ver. 22. ἕδεις αἶρει.—*No man taketh.* R. *No one taketh.* See ver. 2. —

Ver. 25. ἐν παροιμίαις.—*In proverbs; margin, in parables.* R. *In parables.* =

Ver. 27. ὅτι ἐγὼ παρὰ Θεοῦ ἐξῆλθον.—*That I came out from God.* R. *That I came forth from God.* +

Ver. 30. νῦν οἶδαμεν ὅτι οἶδας πάντα.—*Now are we sure that thou knowest all things.* R. *Now know we that thou knowest all things.* Properly preserving, what the translators would

seem almost purposely to have avoided, the antithesis between οἶδαμεν οἶδας. +

Ver. 31. ἄρτι πιστεύετε;—*Do ye now believe?* R. also, with margin, *Ye do now believe*, which had better be left out. The question, implying mistrust, is far more forcible, and more after the manner of our Saviour's reasoning. Cf. xiii. 38, τὴν ψυχὴν σε ὑπὲρ ἐμῆ θήσεις; ἀμὴν ἀμὴν λέγω σοι, κ. τ. λ. —

CHAPTER XVII.

Ver. 2. καθὼς ἔδωκας αὐτῷ ἐξουσίαν πάσης σαρκὸς, ἵνα πᾶν ὃ δέδωκας αὐτῷ, δώσῃ αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον.—*As thou hast given him power over all flesh, that he should give eternal life to as many as thou hast given him.* R. *According as thou gavest him power over all flesh, that whatsoever thou hast given him, to them he should give eternal life.* By this the distinction between ἔδωκας and δέδωκας is preserved, as in the following verses (Pref. vii.). And the transition from πᾶν ὃ to αὐτοῖς, is better marked. +

Ver. 3. αὕτη δέ ἐστιν ἡ αἰώνιος ζωὴ.—*And this is life eternal.* R. *And this is the life eternal.* In xii. 25 and 50, ζ. αἰών. A. V., respectively *life eternal* and *life everlasting*, R. alters into *eternal life* and *everlasting life*. Here we have ζ. αἰών., followed by ἡ αἰών. ζ. R. reverses them into *eternal life* and *the life eternal*. If ver. 3 needs alteration, it might stand, *And this is that eternal life*. But the article is only added because of the preceding, ζ. αἰών. Compare *Thucyd.*, i. 61, καταλαμβάνουσι τὰς προτέρας χιλίας Θέρμην ἄρτι ἡρηκότας καὶ Πύδναν πολιορκῶντας προσκαθεζόμενοι δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ τὴν Πύδναν ἐπολιόρκησαν. —

Ver. 3. καὶ, ὃν ἀπέστειλας, Ἰησοῦν Χριστόν.—*And Jesus Christ, whom thou hast sent.* R. *And Jesus Christ, whom thou didst send.* It would equally keep the force of the words, and their order more closely, to render *And him, whom thou sentest, Jesus Christ*. Bp. Middleton has an excellent notice of this verse. —

Ver. 4. ἐδόξασα . . . ἐτελείωσα—δέδωκας.—*I have glorified—I have finished—thou gavest.* R. *I glorified—I finished—thou hast given*; as also ver. 6, ἐφάνέρωσα, *I have manifested*. R. *I manifested*, and several subsequent corrections of tense, errors as to which are more numerous than usual in A. V. of this chapter. +

Ver. 9. ἐγὼ περὶ αὐτῶν ἐρωτῶ.—*I pray for them.* R. Also. Would not ἐρωτῶ be better expressed even here by—*I plead in behalf of them*. See xii. 21, and at xiv. 16, *ask*, or *plead with*, would seem equally to express ἐρωτήσω. —

Ver. 10. καὶ τὰ ἐμὰ πάντα σὰ ἐστὶ, καὶ τὰ σὰ ἐμὰ.—*And all mine are thine, and thine are mine.* R. *And all things that are mine are thine, and thine are mine.* We are almost reminded of the similar use of these pronouns to express a totally different idea.

Ῥᾶστα γὰρ τὸ σόν τε σύ,
Κἀγὼ διοίσω τοῦμόν.^d

Ver. 12. ἐτήρην . . . ἐφύλαξα.—*I kept—I have kept.* R. *I kept—I watched over.* Better to distinguish the two different verbs; not that there is any intrinsic difference between them. Thus *Thuc.* ii. 3, φυλάξαντες ἔτι νύκτα, *ibid.* iii. 22, τηρήσαντες νύκτα χειμέριον, both in the sense of *waiting for*. So *S. c. Theb.* 126, πόλιν φύλαξον = *Vesp.* 210, τηρεῖν Σκιώνην, *to watch over*. "Ὅσα μὲν ἐν παρ' ἐμῷ προσήκε φυλαχθῆναι, πάντα δικαίως ὑμῖν τετήρηται.—*Dem. c. Meid.* 515, *ubi v. Buttm.* +

Ver. 12. καὶ οὐδεὶς ἐξ αὐτῶν ἀπώλετο.—*And none of them is lost.* R. *And not one of them perished.* The more emphatic *not one* is, perhaps, in this place an improvement; in that case the original should be written οὐδ' εἰς (*Pors. Præf. Hec.*). But is not ἀπώλετο in that present sense of the aorist so often already found in St. John, as ἐδοξάσθη, xv. 8? moreover Judas had not yet *perished*. —

Ver. 15. ἐκ τοῦ πονηροῦ.—*From the evil.* R. *From evil.* Is it not, *From the evil one?* as certainly ὁ πον. is, *Matt.* xiii. 19; and as most probably it is, *Matt.* vi. 13; 1 *John* v. 19. —

Ver. 17. ἀγλασον αὐτὰς ἐν τῇ ἀληθείᾳ σου.—*Sanctify them through thy truth.* R. *Sanctify them in thy truth.* Is it not the common use of ἐν, signifying the instrument = *with thy truth*. The same idea we had xv. 3. There our Lord says, that the disciples are clean through his word; here he asks the Father to sanctify them by his truth, and then adds, *thy word is truth*. —

Ver. 19. ἡγιασμένοι ἐν ἀληθείᾳ.—*Sanctified through the truth; in margin, truly sanctified.* R. *In truth.* The same applies here as to the last verse, ἐν ἀλ. = *by, or with truth*. —

Ver. 20. οὐ περὶ τέτων δὲ ἐρωτῶ μόνον.—*Neither pray I for these alone.* R. *Yet not for these alone do I pray.* Another instance of the separated δὲ. +

Ver. 21. ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἐν ἡμῖν ἐν ᾧσι.—*That they also may be one in us.* R. *Even so that they also may be one in us.* Simpler as it stands in A. V. —

Ver. 24. θέλω.—*I will.* R. Also. Which sense of θέλω R. repudiated v. 6 and ix. 27. =

Ver. 25. καὶ ὁ κόσμος σε οὐκ ἔγνω.—*The world hath not*

known thee. R. *And the world knew thee not.* Καὶ=*and yet*; as it should also be, i. 10, καὶ ὁ κόσμος αὐτὸν οὐκ ἔγνω. —

Ver. 26. καὶ ἐγνώρισα . . . καὶ γνωρίσω.—*And I have declared . . . and will declare it.* R. *And I made known . . . and will make known*; γνωρ. being used clearly in distinction to ἔγνω before. +

Ver. 26. ἵνα ἡ ἀγάπη ἣν ἠγάπησάς με.—*That the love wherewith thou hast loved me.* R. *That the love wherewith thou lovedst me.* Ἀγαπᾶν with a cognate accusative is unusual, but not without example in classical authors, Cf. Jelf, 549, c. On the difference between ἀγαπᾶν and φιλεῖν, see Trench, *Syn.*, p. 45, Liddell and Scott, s. v. +

CHAPTER XVIII.

Ver. 3. τὴν σπεῖραν.—*A band.* R. *The band.* Whatever the article may intimate it should certainly be expressed. We have the same word, in both instances with a distinctive addition, Acts x. 1; xxvii. 1. Here it may perhaps mean, as some have explained it, *the band on duty.* See Middleton. +

Ver. 5. εἰστήκει.—*Stood.* R. *Was standing.* +

Ver. 9. ἃς δέδωκάς μοι, οὐκ ἀπόλεσα ἐξ αὐτῶν ἐδένα.—*Of them which thou gavest me, have I lost none.* R. *Of them which thou hast given me I lost none.* But consistently with R. xvii. 12, *not one.* +

Ver. 15. ἠκολούθει δὲ τῷ Ἰησοῦ Σίμων Πέτρος, καὶ ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής.—*And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and so did another disciple.* R. *And Simon Peter and the other disciple followed Jesus.* Keeping the singular ἠκολούθει with its direct nominative (for St. John, himself ὁ ἄλλ. μαθ., desired to record that Peter, rather than that he, followed Jesus) we may render, *And Simon Peter followed Jesus, and the other disciple.* One of Bishop Middleton's best notes is upon ὁ ἄλλος μαθητής. It is remarkable that the translators should have disregarded the article in ver. 15, while they have expressed it almost too strongly in ver. 16. —

Ver. 16. εἰστήκει.—*Stood.* R. Also, though altering ver. 5. Here=*remained standing.* —

Ver. 17. μὴ καὶ σὺ;—*Art not thou also?* R. *Art thou also?* As Scholefield here and elsewhere. +

Ver. 18. εἰστήκεισαν . . . καὶ ἐθερμαίνοντο.—*Stood, and they warmed themselves.* R. *Were standing, and they warmed themselves.* Render, *Were standing . . . and were warming themselves.* —

Ver. 18. ἦν δὲ μετ' αὐτῶν ὁ Πέτρος ἐστὼς καὶ θερμαινόμενος.—*And Peter stood with them, and warmed himself.* R. *And Peter was standing with them, and warming himself.* Render,

And Peter was with them, standing and warming himself. This is merely a repetition of the former phrase; there two imperfects of the main verbs, here the imperfect ἦν with the two participles of the main verbs, which must be taken together, and separate from ἦν. We have an instance in point:

Ὅθι ξανθὸς Μενέλαος
βλήμενος ἦν.*

where ἦν goes with ὅθι, and must not be joined with βλήμενος. So, again, at ver. 25, μετ' αὐτῶν or ἐκεῖ must be supplied after ἦν.

Ver. 21. ἐπερώτησον τὰς ἀκηκοότας.—*Ask them which heard me.* R. Also. Render, *Ask those who have heard me.* —

Ver. 22. παρεστηκώς.—*Which stood by.* R. *Who was standing by.* Render, *Standing by.* There is no article. —

Ver. 24. ἐπέστειλεν.—*Had sent.* R. *Sent.* +

Ver. 28. ἄγουσιν οὖν τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἀπὸ τῆς Καϊάφα εἰς τὸ πραιτώριον.—*Then led they . . . unto the hall of judgment,* in marg., *Pilate's house.* R. *Lead . . . unto the palace of the governor.* Unless, as proposed in the case of Latin coins in Greek dress, it were simply rendered, *The Prætorium*, with a marginal explanation. +

Ver. 28. ἵνα μὴ μιανθῶσιν, ἀλλ' ἵνα.—*Lest they should be defiled, but that.* R. *That they might not be defiled, but that they might.* ἵνα μὴ, ἀλλ' ἵνα. +

Ver. 31. λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς.—*Take ye him.* R. *Take him yourselves.* +

Ver. 36. εἰ . . . οἱ ὑπηρέται ἂν οἱ ἐμοὶ ἡγωνίζοντο.—*If . . . then would my servants fight.* R. *If . . . my servants would fight.* A. V. by *then* wished no doubt to express the ἂν ἡγων. +

Ver. 37. σὺ λέγεις ὅτι βασιλεὺς εἰμ' ἐγώ.—*Thou sayest that I am a king.* R. *Thou sayest; for I am a king.* Far more forcible if the Greek would bear it, which is questionable. +

Ver. 37. εἰς τὸτο γεγέννημαι, καὶ εἰς τὸτο ἐλήλυθα εἰς τὸν κόσμον.—*To this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world.* R. *To this end have I been born, and to this end am I come into the world.* +

Ver. 40. ἐκράυγασαν οὖν πάλιν πάντες.—*Then cried they all again.* R. *Then they all cried out again.* A. V. marks better the πάντες placed last; it is not πάντες ἐκράυγασαν. —

CHAPTER XIX.

Ver. 2. καὶ ἱμάτιον πορφυρεὶν περιέβαλον αὐτὸν.—*And they put on him a purple robe.* R. *And they clothed him with a*

purple robe. So far better, as it avoids ἐπέθηκαν, *put on*, and περιέβαλον, *put on*. By rendering ἐπέθηκαν *placed it on*, we may retain A. V., which in itself more clearly marks the unusual double accusative after περιέβαλον. —

Ver. 6. λάβετε αὐτὸν ὑμεῖς.—*Take ye him.* R. *Take him yourselves*, as xviii. 31. +

Ver. 11. οὐκ εἶχες ἐξουσίαν ἐδεμῖαν κατ' ἐμῶ, εἰ μὴ ἦν σοι δεδομένον ἄνωθεν.—*Thou couldst have no power at all against me, except it were given thee from above.* R. *Thou wouldst have no power against me, except it had been given thee from above.* +

Ver. 11. διὰ τῆτο ὁ παραδιδὲς μέ σοι μείζονα ἁμαρτίαν ἔχει.—*Therefore he that delivered me unto thee hath the greater sin.* R. *For this cause he that delivereth me unto thee hath the greater sin.* +

Ver. 12. ἐκ τῆτε.—*From henceforth.* R. *Upon this*; ἐκ is rather temporal than causal here. =

Ver. 13. ἐκάθισεν ἐπὶ τῇ βήματι, εἰς τόπον λεγόμενον.—*Sat down in the judgment-seat in a place that is called.* R. *Sat down upon the judgment-seat in a place that is called*; merely gives ἐπὶ more strictly, as it might have given εἰς τ., *at a place*, and λεγ., *called*, omitting the superfluous *that is*; compare λεγ. with τὸν λεγ., ver. 17. —

Ver. 17. εἰς τὸν λεγόμενον Κρανίος τόπον.—*Into a place called the place of a skull.* R. *Unto the place called the place of a skull.* Render, *Unto the place of a skull, as it is called*, Jelf, 438, obs., so that τὸν λεγ. and ὅς λέγεται correspond, except that the former is idiomatic. —

Ver. 18. ὅπου αὐτὸν ἐσταύρωσαν, καὶ μετ' αὐτῷ ἄλλες δύο, ἐντεῦθεν καὶ ἐντεῦθεν, μέσον δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν.—*Where they crucified him, and two others with him, on either side one, and Jesus in the midst.* R. Also. Render, *Where they crucified him, and with him other two, on either side, but in the midst Jesus.* First the fact of the crucifixion, then the manner of it, to make its ignominy greater, a malefactor on either side, *but* Jesus in the midst, ἄλλες δύο, as elsewhere, with numerals, Matt. iv. 21; xxv. 16, 17. Luke x. 1. —

Ver. 19. ἔγραψε δὲ καὶ τίτλον ὁ Πιλάτος.—*And Pilate wrote a title.* R. *Moreover Pilate wrote a title.* +

Ver. 19. καὶ ἦν γεγραμμένον.—*And the writing was.* R. *And there was written.* Unless rather, *and the inscription was*, as γεγρ. is neut. following the masc. τίτλος. +

Ver. 24. τὰ ἱμάτιά μου.—*My raiment.* R. *My garments*, as ver. 23. —

Ver. 25. εἰστήκεισαν δέ.—*Now there stood.* R. *But there stood.* Render, *Now there were standing.* —

Ver. 25. *Μαρία ἡ τῆ Κλωπᾶ.*—*Mary the wife of Cleophas.* In margin, *Clopas.* R. *Clopas.* See here Pearson, p. 176. =

Ver. 26. *Ἰησὺς οὖν ἰδὼν.*—*When Jesus therefore saw.* R. *Jesus therefore seeing.* Render, *Jesus therefore, when he saw.* —

Ver. 28. *ὅτι πάντα ἤδη τετέλεσται.*—*That all things were now accomplished.* R. *That all things were now finished.* Better, from the emphatic *τετέλεσται*, ver. 30. +

Ver. 29. *οἱ δὲ, πλήσαντες καὶ περιθέντες, προσήνεγκαν.*—*And they filled . . . and put it upon . . . and put it to.* R. *And they filled . . . and fixed it upon . . . and put it to.* There is the same objection to A. V. as at ver. 2. Upon *οἱ δὲ*, see Middleton, p. 362, it had better be carried to its verb *προσήν.*, giving to the two aorist participles their proper sense, *And they, after filling a sponge, and fixing it upon a hyssop stalk, put it to his mouth.* —

Ver. 29. *ὑσσώπῳ.*—*Hyssop.* R. *A stalk of hyssop.* The many different words that have been suggested here are no better than so many needless guesses; the worst of all perhaps being that which would assign to *καλάμῳ*, Matt. xxvii. 48, the sense of a soldier's spear-staff. In its simple meaning of *reed*, it at once explains *ὑσσώπῳ* here, as rightly given in R. +

Ver. 31. *ἐπεὶ παρασκευὴ ἦν.*—*Because it was the preparation.* R. *Since it was*, and gives the order of the words more correctly from the Greek. On *παρασκευὴ*, Cf. Pearson, p. 263-4, and on *ἡ ἡμέρα ἐκείνη*, see Middleton *in loc*, p. 363. +

Ver. 33. *ἐπὶ δὲ τὸν Ἰησοῦν ἐλθόντες, ὥς εἶδον.*—*But when they came to Jesus, and saw.* R. *But coming to Jesus, when they saw.* Render, *But upon coming to Jesus, when they saw.* —

Ver. 38. *κεκρυμμένος δὲ.*—*But secretly.* R. *But in secret.* This is an unusual sense of *κεκρυμμένος*, but something like it occurs twice in the *Electra* of Sophocles, *κλύοις ἄν κεκρυμμένην μου βάξιν*, *ambiguum vocem*, ver. 628; *φανέντες, ἢ κεκρυμμένοι*, *Ib.*, 1286. =

Ver. 39. *ἦλθε δὲ καὶ Νικόδημος.*—*And there came also Nicodemus.* R. *And there came Nicodemus also*; by no means a needless alteration. +

Ver. 39. *φέρων.*—*And brought.* R. *Bringing.* It is the ordinary phrase *ἦλθε φέρων*=*he came with*, Jelf, 698, obs. 2. —

Ver. 40. *καθὼς ἔθος ἐστὶ τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐνταφιάζειν.*—*As the manner of the Jews is to bury.* R. *As is the manner of the Jews to bury.* *Ἐνταφιάζειν*=*to prepare for burial*, Matt. xxvi. 12, where alone it is used again in N. T.; it is applied also to *τὸ μύρον*. —

Ver. 42. *ἐκεῖ ἔν ἔθηκαν τὸν Ἰησοῦν.*—R. differs from A. V. only in the better order of the words. +

CHAPTER XX.

Ver. 1. τῇ δὲ μιᾷ τῶν σαββάτων.—*The first day of the week.* R. *Now on the first day of the week.* Had there been no division into chapters δὲ would merely have connected this sentence with the foregoing. Commencing a fresh chapter it may rather be expressed *now* than *but*, as it would otherwise have been. +

Ver. 3. καὶ ἤρχοντο εἰς τὸ μνημεῖον.—*And came to the sepulchre.* R. *And they went toward the sepulchre.* This rather more expresses the imperfect. +

Ver. 4. ἔτρεχον δὲ οἱ δύο ὁμῶς.—*So they ran both together.* R. *And they ran both together.* But if the imperf. ἤρχοντο needed altering, surely ἔτρεχον does, the rather as προέδραμε follows directly. Οἱ δύο, also, is scarcely well given. Read, *And they were running, the two together.* —

Ver. 4. προέδραμε τάχιον τῷ Πέτρῳ.—*Did outrun Peter.* R. Also. But the προ., and the comparative also, are to be accounted for. *Ran first (or forward) more quickly than Peter.* —

Ver. 5. παρακύψας.—*Stooping down and looking in,* the last in ital. R. Also. Surely *looking in* may be omitted, especially with βλέπει following. So it may again, ver. 11, by simply rendering εἰς towards. —

Ver. 6. θεωρεῖ.—*Seeth.* R. Also. In most other places, as below, ver. 14, R. renders θεωρ. *to behold*, and here it wants to be distinguished from βλέπει, ver. 5. —

Ver. 7. ὃ ἦν ἐπὶ τῆς κεφαλῆς.—*That was about his head.* R. Also. Render, *Which had been upon his head, ἦν=was* (before). —

Ver. 9. οὐδέπω γὰρ ᾔδεισαν.—*For as yet they knew not.* R. Also. Render, *For they did not yet know.* —

Ver. 12. δύο ἄγγελοι . . . ἓνα πρὸς τῇ κεφαλῇ, καὶ ἓνα πρὸς τοῖς ποσίν.—*Two angels . . . the one at the head, and the other at the feet.* R. Also. With *one for the one.* Why not, *Two angels . . . one at the head, and one at the feet?* —

Ver. 14. καὶ οὐκ ᾔδει.—*And knew not.* R. Also. Render, *And did not know, that is, was not aware.* =

Ver. 15. δοκῶσα ὅτι ὁ κηπερός ἐστι.—*Supposing him to be the gardener.* R. *Supposing that it was the gardener.* Unless, rather—the keeper of the garden. +

Ver. 17. οὐπω γὰρ ἀναβέβηκα.—*For I am not yet ascended.* R. Also. Render, *For I have not yet ascended,* since ἀναβαίνω comes in the next sentence. That, too, might perhaps be better, *I am ascending,* to mark that it was immediately to be. =

Ver. 18. ἔρχεται . . . ἀπαγγέλλεσα.—*Came and told.* R.

Cometh and bringeth tidings. Is it not rather, *Cometh with the tidings.* The participle is much as φέρων., xix. 39. Cf. Xen. Hell. 2. 1. 29, ἡ Πάραλος ἐς τὰς Ἀθήνας ἐπλευσεν ἀπαγγέλλουσα τὰ γεγονότα. —

Ver. 19. οὕσης οὖν ὀψίας, τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ.—*Then the same day at evening.* R. *When it was evening, therefore, on that same day.* +

Ver. 19. τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων.—*When the doors were shut.* R. *The doors being shut.* Render, *When the doors had been shut*: διὰ τὸν φόβον, also, = by reason of their fear of the Jews, see vii. 13. —

Ver. 20. ἐχάρησαν οὖν οἱ μαθηταὶ ἰδόντες τὸν Κύριον.—*Then were the disciples glad, when they saw the Lord.* R. Also. But *then* and *when* clash as if they were both temporal adverbs, and *were glad* seems scarcely strong enough to express ἐχάρησαν. *The disciples therefore rejoiced (or were gladdened) when they saw the Lord.* —

Ver. 25. βάλω τὸν δακτ. . . . βάλω τὴν χεῖρα.—*Put my finger . . . thrust my hand..* R. *Put in each case.* +

Ver. 27. εἶτα.—*Then.* R. *After that.* Render, *Afterwards.* =

Ver. 31. ζῶν ἔχητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι αὐτοῦ.—*Ye might have life through his name.* R. *Ye may have life in his name,* see xvii. 17. Cf. Acts iv. 12, οὐδὲ γὰρ ὄνομά ἐστιν ἕτερον . . . ἐν ᾧ δεῖ σωθῆναι ἡμᾶς, *whereby we must be saved.* + —

wherein

CHAPTER XXI.

Ver. 1. ἐφάνερωσε δὲ οὕτως.—*And on this wise shewed he himself.* R. *And he manifested himself on this wise.* +

Ver. 3. ἐρχόμεθα καὶ ἡμεῖς σὺν σοὶ.—*We also go with thee.* R. *We also come with thee.* Not but ἐρχεσθαι = to go as well as to come. But here it is to be distinguished from ὑπάγω. +

Ver. 3. ἐνέβησαν εἰς τὸ πλοῖον.—*Entered into a ship.* R. *Entered into the ship.* Render, *Went on board their vessel.* See Middleton in loc. Ἐμβ εἰς πλ. or ναῦν, is a nautical term, as much as ἀνέβη, ver. 11. R. *Went aboard.* Cf. Herod. 2. 29, ἐς ἕτερον πλοῖον ἐμβὰς. + —

Ver. 4. πρωίας δὲ ἤδη γενομένης.—*But when the morning was now come.* R. *But when morning was now come,* as the reverse, ὀψίας ἔσης, xx. 19. +

Ver. 5. μή τι προσφάγιον ἔχετε;—*Have ye any meat?* R. *Have ye any fish?* Though the word, as its derivation shews, is strictly anything to be eaten *with* meat, but as addressed to the disciples when fishing, and from ὀψάριον, ver. 9, it is clearly better rendered *fish?* +

Ver. 7. ἀκέσας . . . διεζώσατο . . . ἔβαλεν.—*When he heard.*
R. *Hearing.* —

Ver. 7. *Girt unto him.* R. *Girt about him.* +

Ver. 7. *Did cast.* R. *Cast.* Yet in other places R. frequently inserts this objectionable *did*; e. g. xv. 16, ἐξελέξασθε, *did choose*, for *chose*. +

Ver. 8. τῷ πλοιαρίῳ.—*In a little ship.* R. *In the boat* = as ver. 3, *their boat*. + —

Ver. 8. ἀλλ' ὥς ἀπὸ πηχῶν διακοσίων.—*But as it were two hundred cubits.* R. *But about two hundred cubits off*; marking the unusual ἀπὸ. +

Ver. 9. ὥς οὖν ἀπέβησαν εἰς τὴν γῆν.—*As soon then as they were come to land.* R. *As soon then as they had gone out upon the land.* Ἀπεβ. as ἐνεβ., ver. 3; ἀνεβ., ver. 11, is technical. Cf. *Thuc.* i. 100, Ἐς τὴν γῆν ἀπέβησαν, only it is there in a hostile sense. Render, *When they disembarked*, or rather, *went on shore*. —

Ver. 9. ἀνθρακιὰν κείμενην καὶ ὀψάριον ἐπικείμενον.—*A fire of coals there, and fish laid thereon.* R. *A fire of coals there, and fish lying thereon.* But surely κειμ. ἐπικείμ. should be expressed, *A fire of coals laid, and fish laid upon it*. —

Ver. 11. οὐκ ἐσχίσθη τὸ δίκτυον.—*Yet was not the net broken.* R. *The net was not broken.* Rather, *the net was not rent*. That the essential difference may be marked between ἐσχίσθη and διεῖρήγνυτο, *Luke* v. 6, another word, and in another tense. Here, *the net was not rent*; there, *the net was breaking asunder*, or *was beginning to break*; though none of the fish were lost. It is, doubtless, worth while to preserve trace of this difference, when the spiritual lesson conveyed in both the miracles is considered. —

Ver. 13. λαμβάνει τὸν ἄρτον.—*Taketh bread.* R. *Taketh the bread*, namely, that ἄρτον, in ver. 9. +

Ver. 14. ἐφανερώθη.—*Shewed himself.* R. *Was manifested*, as a better English equivalent for φαν., and not to preclude the reflexive sense from aor. pass. See *Jelf*, 367, 2. Cf. *Thuc.* ii. 81, οἰηθῆναι. A. Suppl. 383, ἀντιωθῆναι. +

Ver. 16. ποιμαίνει τὰ πρόβατά μου.—*Feed my sheep.* R. *Keep my sheep.* It would, as far as ποιμ. is concerned, be better *shepherd my sheep*; but that would require, not πρόβατα, but ποίμνην, as *1 Cor.* ix. 7, τίς ποιμαίνει ποίμνην. It would be hard to find another passage where any English translation must of necessity fail so entirely in expressing the full force of the Greek. The transitions from ἀγαπᾷς to φιλεῖς; from βόσκει to ποιμαίνει; from ἄρνια to πρόβατα; it is quite hopeless to attempt to maintain. We may reason upon, but cannot render them. Cf. *Trench, Syn.*, pp. 48 and 96; and *Markland*, h. l. +

Ver. 18. ὅταν δὲ γηράσῃς.—*But when thou shalt be old.* R. *But when thou art grown old.* +

Ver. 19. ποίῳ θανάτῳ.—*By what death.* R. *By what manner of death.* See note xii. 33. +

Ver. 20. ἐν τῷ δείπνῳ.—*At supper.* R. *At the supper.* A.V. would refer to an habitual act; R. properly refers to the specific δείπνον, chap. xiii. 23—25. +

Ver. 23. ἐξῆλθεν ἔν ὁ λόγος οὗτος.—*Then went this saying abroad.* R. *This saying therefore went abroad.* Οὖν expresses the consequence of our Lord's previous words. Ἐξῆλθεν, perhaps more simply, as hitherto rendered, *went forth.* +

Ver. 23. ὅτι ὁ μαθητὴς ἐκεῖνος ἐκ ἀποθνήσκει.—*That that disciple should not die.* R. *That that disciple was not to die.* That is, as if our Lord had said, ἐκεῖνος οὐκ ἀποθανεῖται. +

Ver. 25. καθ' ἓν.—*Every one.* R. Also. Strictly speaking, καθ' ἓν = *severally*, or *one by one*, which is, after all, what *every one* means. =

CONCLUSION.

The examination of this Revised Version of St. John's Gospel is now brought to a close. It has been followed out as carefully and accurately as other and constant occupations would admit of, and, it may be hoped, in a courteous and Christian spirit; seeking no mere triumph of argument, but seeking only to elucidate the truth. For all the revisers there must needs be felt great respect; for one of them, as an old pupil, there is the stronger feeling of affectionate regard. Moreover, when it has seemed necessary to question any proposed alteration, it has never been forgotten, that the concurrent opinions of five were more likely to be right, and the one single opinion to be wrong. It has always, therefore, been a satisfaction to agree with the revisers; but too often a duty to dissent from them. It need hardly be said that each successive suggestion has been anxiously weighed; while the grounds upon which it has been deemed admissible or not are plainly stated. In this respect, the inquiry has been pursued at manifest disadvantage; inasmuch, as it has had to deal with the new renderings as it found them, having no clue to the reasons upon which they are based; had it been otherwise, the conclusions arrived at might in some cases have been different. The inquiry has been pursued under another, and that a self-imposed disadvantage. No new edition, such as Alford's or Wordsworth's, no recent commentaries of any kind, have been consulted. The revise has been examined solely in the light of previous reading, and with the Greek text alone for a guide. Thus, at any rate, an unbiassed and independent judg-

ment has been brought to bear upon the question, and the opinions of others, however valuable in themselves, have not been imported into it. The changes introduced, from chapter to chapter, are so very numerous, that it is scarcely to be expected they should all and universally be accepted. In many instances alterations are inserted which have been previously put forth by others; not a few of these, perhaps, will fail to commend themselves to the reader, with the single exception of such as Bishop Middleton, and Professor Scholefield, following in his track, have supplied. These of course have reference chiefly to the use of the article in different passages. Upon the whole, it may safely be said that the revisers have been most successful where they are most original. We may readily sum up the advantage that has been gained from the labours of five competent and conscientious clergymen in the emendation of one short portion of Scripture. We must set aside all such alterations as are needless and immaterial; since these would only disturb the received version without improving it. We must reject all such alterations as seem inexpedient and incorrect; since these would graft error instead of truth upon our Scriptures. And then the comparatively few essential and unquestionable alterations which remain may well be turned to profit, either as marginal readings, or, *under legitimate authority*, they may be incorporated into the received text. That out of so many changes proposed so small a number should be found intrinsically needful; that, the seed of an homer being cast, it has yielded no more than an ephah; this is only what might have been expected from the first. It is simply a strong and practical witness to the excellence of the Authorized Version. It is proof that we are already in possession, not of dross or tin, requiring to be lacquered and gilded over, but the pure gold itself, which, tried in the balance, is not found wanting. In short, this non-result is the very best result that we should have desired from any attempt at the revision of our Scriptures. The greater the personal weight and learning of those who adventure the attempt, the stronger the reaction must be in favour of our received translation. While it serves on the one hand to proclaim its unimpeachable truthfulness, it surely must also tend to lay at rest that unquiet spirit of change which of late has been so busy amongst us, imposing on the ignorant; terrifying the faint-hearted; and disturbing all. If such in any measure shall be the issue of this first experiment at revision, none doubtless will so much rejoice at it as the revisers themselves.

F. E. G.

THE PERIODS OF OUR LORD'S LIFE AND MINISTRY.

IN the number of this Journal for January, 1856, we ventured to lay before its readers some reasons for concluding that our Saviour's ministry was of less duration than modern commentators usually assign to it. The subject there, however, was mixed up with the more comprehensive one; as to the attributed error in the Christian Epoch, under which it is supposed to fall four years later than its true commencement.

The question is still open, as to the length and circumstances of our Lord's life; and probably will continue to be discussed, as long as the two spirits of dubitation and controversy find their abode in the hearts of men. We are not vain enough, therefore, to hope to eject so flourishing a plant from the *Hortus Theologicus*, nor would it be wise to do so; for the result being religiously unimportant of all discussions upon the subject, yet the pursuit of these discussions leads to scriptural readings and communings with the things that are written, that cannot but be serviceable to those who engage in them. But as regards the question itself, the ground we take is, that it may be better understood by keeping our views upon the true standard of dates about that period, which is found in the consular lists of the age of Augustus. Many of the isolated questions that are raised on the subject are absolutely answered at once by that reference, and never ought to have been printed as matters of real controversy.

The consular lists of Dion Cassius and Cassiodorus, given in our former paper, during the whole reign of Augustus, are absolutely without doubt or question:—the “Fasti Consulares,” or engraved list of consuls on the walls of the forum, which came down to the end of the reign of Augustus, were extant when Dio wrote, and give a certain authenticity to the list of that historian. We think the *Annals* of Tacitus afford as sure a guide for those of the reign of Tiberius; and by these two standards we shall regulate our present conclusions.

Now, according to these lists, we find that the consulate of Cn. Dom. Calvinus and C. Asinius Pollio, under which about the midsummer of that year Herod was elected King of Judæa by the Roman senate, is the ninth consulate before that of Augustus and Messala Corvinus; in which on the 2nd September the Battle of Actium was fought, and the date of the empire in Augustus initiated. From the year of Herod's elec-

tion by the senate, Josephus says that Herod reigned 37 years; and from that year to the consulate of the two Gemini, in which all authorities concur in fixing the date of our Lord's death; there are 68 consulates, or 69 inclusive of the epochal year. But, as there were only the last six months of the first of these consulates included in the reign of Herod, and only three months of the last of them within the life of our Lord, the actual time between the accession of Herod (in that way) and the death of Christ, was 67 years and 9 months. Within that space all the different epochs connected with the reign of Herod, his death, and the events of our Saviour's visitation, must undoubtedly be comprehended. This is a good foundation to proceed upon; and the facts of Scripture history will be found to fall in coincidence with the dates of the imperial history and the relations of Josephus, with wonderful accuracy under this regulation. We will consider the matter, therefore, under its different scriptural heads: first—

The Death of Herod.

Of whom Josephus relates, that "he died having reigned since the death of Antigonus, 34 years; but since he was declared king by the Roman senate, 37 years."^a The epoch from the death of Antigonus is used by some authors as the true commencement of Herod's reign, and particularly by Sulpicius Severus, as we shall have occasion to point out presently.

The expression of Josephus certainly intends that Herod died in the 37th year of his reign; for 37 would be the date upon all his coins and documents of that current year. As he died in March and had been elected in June, it is plain there were 9 months accomplished of the current year; and he reigned in temporal duration 36 years and 9 months. This would carry the termination of his life into the 38th consulate from that of his election, (including the epochal one;) and that 38th number is the consulate of Lentulus and Messala, the next in succession to that of Sabinus and Rufus; under whose consulate, without question, Christ was born: for it was "*the year of the taxing.*"

We have assigned the month of March as that in which Herod departed this life; but that is one of the *vexatæ questiones*. The Scripture and Josephus very plainly indicate that death to have happened in the spring of the year; but Josephus unfortunately refers to an eclipse of the moon, which he shews to have happened about the time Herod began to give signs of a final break-up of his constitution; and this eclipse has been

^a *Antiq.*, xvii., 8, 1.

determined by an astronomic theologian to have happened in the month that preceded the passover of that spring; consequently, 29 days only before the day of that feast. But Josephus shews that Herod was buried with great pomp and circumstance by Archelaus, and a sedition put down after the funeral with great slaughter, and yet before that festival day; which circumstances must, of themselves, have occupied several weeks: while he also gives a long account of Herod's increased infirmities, consultations of physicians, a visit to the baths of Callirhoe, and long apparently hygeistic processes upon the royal patient after that eclipse, and yet antecedent to his death; after which came the growth of those fierce dispositions when his case had become hopeless, by which he designed to grace his funeral with the death of many of the principal men of the country; a purpose which was succeeded by their summons and compulsory attendance at Jericho, to meet the post-mortem decree of their gentle ruler. All these circumstances must, to ordinary minds, have occupied several months in their enactment; but the decree of science would compel us to believe they all occurred between the pre-paschal full moon, and the death of the king. As all these events may be found by our readers in Josephus' *Antiquities*, b. xvii., c. vi., § 4, and the next chapters, we shall not further expatiate upon them: only it is plain enough, the eclipse of that March could not be the eclipse referred to by Josephus. Dr. Hincks has indeed thrown great discredit upon all these lunar computations as chronological guides, by his letter upon Professor Airy's calculation of the Eclipse of Cræsus, which appeared in last January number of this Journal, p. 463; but we will only avoid the authority of the one we have to do with, by suggesting that a sister eclipse might have occurred in the September before Herod's death, and equally answer the ends of the chronological proof: and we rather wonder that this, which appears so very plain and obvious a way of reconciling the circumstances together of the history and the eclipse, should not have been before referred to. For an eclipse in the month of March involves, by an almost necessary consequence, the happening of an eclipse in the opposite side of the earth's orbit which is in the month of September, in the antecedent or sequent half year; since the nodes of the moon must be nearly in similar conjunction with the sun and earth in both positions. We find a case in point, and almost identical with the one in question, of very recent occurrence: where a lunar eclipse of the 8th and 9th March, 1849, was preceded by a lunar eclipse on the 13th of the antecedent September, 1848: for the pre-paschal eclipse of Herod's death year being assigned to the night of the 12th

and 13th March, it would involve, by analogy with the modern instance, an autumnal eclipse on the 16th September preceding; and as that was the very period of the year when the day of "expiation" fell, with which the events related by Josephus in connexion with that eclipse are associated, by an incident there related; it seems there can be no doubt of the correctness of this view of the subject.^b

The Birth of Our Lord.

Whatever doubts may have grown up from modern controversy as to the age of our Lord, one would think that "that year" in which his birth happened must have been quite undisputed among the early Churches. It was undoubtedly in the year of "*The taxing*," which was made towards the end of Herod's life, but put in force by Cyrenius ten years after his death; that is, immediately after the deposition of Archelaus. "*The Consular Year*" of this assessment could not fail to be popularly known, for it must have been cited in every levy that was made of the new tribute. The record of that assessment was in fact long referred to by the Christian apologists, as existing in the public archives at Rome. Justin Martyr does so to the Emperor Antoninus Pius, and Tertullian does so in his treatise against Marcion. It seems impossible therefore, that the designation of the consular year of that birth could ever have been mistaken; and though we only find one historical mention of it by its consular designation, as far as we know, which is in the history of Sulpicius Severus; it seems under such circumstances, that that authority, as recording a popular undisputed tradition about which no difference could exist, ought to satisfy us. Now this writer distinctly states "that it was in the consulate of *Sabinus* and *Rufinus* that Christ was born."^c The rest of his testimony is not trustworthy, but that fact as to the names of the consulate could not err. Sulpicius adds, that it was "on the 8th day before the calends of December," which answers to the 25th December. This day also has been objected to by modern commentators, and a great many others suggested in its place; but the early fathers received it as part of the evidence which had been derived from the Roman archives: and Tertullian's reference to that authority is quite unexceptionable on the subject, since it had nothing to do with any controversy as to the period of our Lord's birth; but was used simply to satisfy his antagonist Marcion, that our Lord

^b See Josephus' *Antiq.*, b. xvii., 6, 4; and Whiston's Note.

^c *Hist. Sacr.*, lib. ii., c. 27.

was born into the world in the ordinary way, and was "*entered*" in that registration as other children of his own village were.^d We shall be content, therefore, notwithstanding Scaliger's and his followers' hypothesis—that the birth happened about the autumnal equinox—to regard the day and month as that which the old churches received; viz., the 25th December, and the year as the consular year of *Sabinus* and *Rufinus*.

This consulate stands next before that of "*Lentulus and Messala*;" under which, in the spring, the death of Herod took place; and that year is called by Josephus, "the 34th year of Herod's reign, after he had procured Antigonus to be slain." It is plain, the preceding year of Sabinus and Rufinus, by the same reckoning, would therefore be the 33rd year of his reign from the same epoch:—accordingly we find it so stated by Sulpicius Severus in the place above cited,—“under Herod in the 33rd year of his reign, Christ was born; Sabinus and Rufinus being consuls; on the 8th day before the calends of January.”

Beginning of John Baptist's Ministry.

We take of course the authority of St. Luke as irrefragable, that this ministry took its commencement in the 15th year of Tiberius; and that that computation dates from the adoptive title of that emperor, three years before the death of Augustus. In our former paper of January, 1856, we gave reasons for concluding that this 15th year of Tiberius could not have had an earlier inception than the month of October, in the consulate of Agrippa and Lentulus; three years and five months before the 25th March in the consulate of the two Gemini, which was the period of our Lord's crucifixion.^e That conclusion, however, was as to the possible, rather than the probable epoch; for it proceeded on the *possibility* of the adoptive acts, by which Tiberius and Germanicus were promoted, the one to the purple and the other to the consulate, having taken place immediately after the return of the two generals from Germany in the month of September of that year.

The probable date of those occurrences would undoubtedly be at the beginning of the next consular year; when Germanicus took his new office of consul upon him, and was so prepared to hail the new associate of the empire, according to the wish of Augustus. The difference is only three months; but we may regard the latter as the true epoch of the adoptive accession; viz., the 1st January of the consulate of "*Gætulicus and*

^d *Tertul. adv. Marcion*, l. iv., c. 17.

^e See *J. S. L.* of that date, p. 264.

Sabinus ;"—the 66th of the 69 consulates under consideration. By that course, the commencement of John's ministry would be confined to some period within that year, whose commencement was 3 years and 3 months before the death of our Lord Christ. It could not either be earlier than the commencement of that year, or after the day of the anniversary of Augustus' death in the preceding one, that Pontius Pilate could have arrived as "procurator" in Judæa. For this consulate of "*Gætulicus and Sabinus*" is the 12th in number from that of the two *Sexti*, in which Augustus died; making 11 full years up to the 19th August of that antecedent year. But 11 years was the period of the government of Gratus, the predecessor of Pilate; who took the government from Annius Rufus by the gift of Tiberius, immediately after Augustus' death. Josephus's account of these changes is very precise: "Tiberius was now, on the death of Augustus, the third emperor, and he sent Valerius Gratus to be procurator of Judæa, and to succeed A. Rufus; and Gratus having fulfilled his service, went back to Rome after he had tarried in Judæa 11 years, when Pontius Pilate came as his successor.^f

The meaning is, to the 12th year; and we may assign therefore the coming of Pilate with great probability to the beginning of that consular year, which was the 12th of Gratus; namely, the year of *Gætulicus and Sabinus*, or the same in which John's ministry began.

Josephus again relates that Pontius Pilate was 10 years in Judæa; and taking this also to mean to the 11th year, it tallies exactly; for Pontius Pilate was deposed by Vitellius the governor of Syria for extortion and cruelty, and this evidently happened early in the year, which must have been his 11th year; for being ordered to hasten to Rome, he found Tiberius dead. The period of his departure is plainly shewn by the history; which states that Vitellius immediately after he had dismissed Pilate to Rome, went up to the Jews' Feast of the Passover at Jerusalem, and remitted the obnoxious taxes Pilate had imposed. It is clear, therefore, Pilate was sent off early in the month of March of his 11th year, and found Tiberius dead on the 26th March; and that Vitellius made his visit to the Feast in the same month.

We say, there were probably nine consulates only from that of *Gætulicus and Sabinus* to that of *Proculus and Nigrinus*, in which year Tiberius died. On this point our authority Dio fails us towards the close of his list, if our supposition is correct; since

^f Joseph. *Antiq.*, b. xviii., c. ii., § 2.

he makes the consular successions in that interval to be eleven. The length of Tiberius' reign is however one of the "vexed questions;" for the *Chronicon Paschale* supplies a list of no less than twelve consulates, after that of Gætulicus and Sabinus to Tiberius' death.

Notwithstanding the assigned break in the *annals of Tacitus*, it is quite plain he omits two of the usually inserted consulates in that period; namely, that of *Vinicius and Longinus*, and *Tiberius and Sejanus*; being the two next in Dio's list after the two Gemini; for he assigns the marriage of Caligula, which Dio dates under the consuls Gallus and Nonianus, to a date two years earlier. This cannot be accounted for, except by a reduced scale of the consular list.⁹

Victorius, another writer of undoubted credit as to the later successions, also omits two consulates, though not the same as Tacitus. They are those of *Domitian and Scribonianus* and of *Galba and Sulla*, being the two which succeed those omitted by Tacitus.

It seems clear that these double pairs of doubtful entries are the original and substitutional consulates of two years only: entered both by Dion Cassius and those who follow him; but of which Victorius and Tacitus have preserved only the proper order of succession, though in a different way;—Victorius having preserved the original or proper consuls of the year, and Tacitus those who were the substituted consuls of the same year.

These entries follow thus, from Dion Cassius:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 70. Vinicius and Longinus | } Omitted by Tacitus, who inserts
the substitutes below. |
| 71. Tiberius and Sejanus | |
| 72. { Ænobarbus and Scribonianus;
but called by Cassiodorus
Vinicius and Longinus .. | } Omitted by Victorius, who inserts
the proper years' consuls above. |
| 73. Galba and Sulla. | |

On the first number we must speak hypothetically; but of Tiberius and Sejanus history is clear, that Tiberius resigned his consulate on the 15th May, when Corn. Sylla was substituted in his place; and that Sejanus vacated his by his death in the month of October. It cannot be doubted that No. 73 are these substituted consuls. The finding the names of Vinicius and Longinus repeated in 72 by Cassiodorus, is a convincing proof also that those two consulates were also of the same year; of

⁹ *Annales*, lib. vi., 20.

which Dio has inserted, as in the other case, the substituted consuls. Cassiodorus kept to the old names, from some difficulty he found in inserting new ones; probably, because he had evidence that those names were not the names of the original consuls of the year, but substitutional names. There are other reasons for supposing these eight consulates of Tiberius, after that of the two Gemini, not to be depended upon; one is, that Dio assigns the consulate of Tiberius' 20th year to Aulus Vitellius and Fabius Persicus, and in his history states, that the consuls of that year were put to death by Tiberius for assuming to celebrate that 20th year of his reign in a way which implied the ceremonial of a decennial confirmation of the empire. A mistake that needs not much refutation, since Aulus Vitellius lived to reign as emperor in the place of Tiberius, 30 years afterwards.

The best direct authorities shew that the years of Tiberius' reign are over estimated. Clemens of Alexandria, at the close of the 2nd century, writes that Augustus reigned 43 years, and Tiberius 22; which tallies with the consular list we have given, with an addition of 6 years beyond the year of our Lord's death. For we make 69 consulates, or 68 years from Herod's accession to that year in which our Lord was crucified, including that year;—and 6 years more will make the period 74 years; so that, as Herod's election by the senate was 9 years before the year of the Battle of Actium, from which or the succeeding December the reign of Augustus was counted, that deducted from the 74 years will give the 65 years, which is the total sum of the two reigns, according to Clemens' authority. It is plain Clemens himself held the opinion, that that was the true account of the matter; for he adds, that "some compute the time of these emperors thus: Julius Cæsar 3 years and 4 months, Augustus 46 years and 4 months, and Tiberius 26 years and 6 months:"—a computation we shall not pretend to explain.

With respect to the reign of Tiberius from the death of Augustus, we think the succession of the Syrian deputies, as stated by Josephus, is the best authority that can be found on that particular point; and it is in perfect agreement with that of Clemens:—that Tiberius appointed Gratus, who held the government 11 years and was succeeded by Pontius Pilate, who held it 10 years and was sent away hastily to Rome at the end of his time on a charge of oppression, and found Tiberius just dead on his arrival at Rome. It is impossible, if that statement is true, that the reign of Tiberius could have exceeded 22 years: it probably did not fully attain that period.

It may appear difficult to conceive that historians could have distributed events over seven years which were the true fruit of

no more than five, and assigned them specifically to consulates named and counted. But, besides that we have shewn that acts were clearly assigned to consulates that never happened under them, the last five years of Tiberius' life, after the death of Sejanus, are absolutely unmarked by any distinctive features except the marriage of some of his family. They are a continuous scene of pretended treasons, impeachments, and executions.

A synopsis from a popular history of that period will shew how easy it would be to add to or diminish the mere "*verba repetita*" of these cruel memorials: thus; "the death of that odious minister (Sejanus) was followed by the general slaughter of all his known friends and family, even to his youthful children. The following year (No. 1) new orders were issued and new executions enacted. The next year (No. 2) except the marriage of Tiberius' granddaughter, the history is continued in the same vein; "a general massacre of Sejanus' friends," etc. In the next year (No. 3) many eminent persons fell by their own hands or the public executioner. In the next (No. 4) the domestic evils continued, Tiberius being no way appeased by time or the innumerable victims he had sacrificed. The next year (No. 5) the same slaughter continued unrelentingly. Lucius Aruseius and several others were condemned and executed; such executions were become so common that they were hardly taken notice of. The next year (No. 6) Tiberius died.^a

It seems hardly credible, independent of all testimony, that such a slaughter of citizens, on account of a pretended association with one obnoxious minister, should have continued so many years.—If the spirit of persecution could have passed its second year, it seems beyond the usual course of such measures;—but circumstances might have extended it into the third year under so persevering a persecutor, as this emperor is represented. No doubt the true length of the tyrant's reign was to the 4th year only after the death of Sejanus; as we think the best authorities shew to have been the case.

It is evident that if Pontius Pilate ruled ten years, and his government expired in the same spring as Tiberius died, as was the case; he must, according to the extended lists of consuls, have entered on his office the second year before the consulate of the two Gemini; in which our Lord was crucified. But that year cannot be made into the 15th year of Tiberius, as St. Luke's account requires; for it is either the 13th, by reference to the death of Augustus, or the 16th by reference to his adoption.

^a See the account of this period in the *Universal History* taken from the current authorities.

The year of our Lord's Baptism.

The commencement of John's ministry being dated, for its earliest probable point, at the commencement of the consulate of *Gætulicus* and *Sabinus*;—3 years and 3 months before the death of our Lord;—it is plain, that our Lord's baptism must have taken place under that same consulate, or the next; and that if his ministry extended only to two years and a quarter, it must have happened at the latter end of the same consulate, as was the first of John's ministry; viz., of *Gætulicus* and *Sabinus*. We take it that such was the case. John the Baptist began his ministry in the summer of that year, probably at the time of the Pentecost, which seems to have been the great epoch of the seasons at that period, and our Lord was baptized in December following;—not on the day, but a few days after the day of his nativity. On that 25th December, according to the conclusions here deduced from the consular *Fasti*, our Saviour completed his 29th year and entered upon his 30th; or to use the phrase of St. Luke; “he began to be of the age of 30 years.”

On this point we must make some observations, since much difficulty is made about the expression, “*began to be about 30 years of age.*” Valpy holds with Macknight, that the *ἀρχόμενος* refers to the “*beginning*” of our Lord's ministry, and not to his age. This is, because they will have our Lord to have been full 30 years of age; or according to Macknight and some others, several years older than that, when he began his ministry. The tables shew he was just 29 years of age when he was baptized, and beginning his 30th year. As to the critical position of Valpy, that “the word *ἀρχόμενος* cannot be construed with the word *ἦν*; and that there is an incongruity in saying “he began to be about such an age,” we quite differ with him. The idiom is common in Xenophon; and it is one of the many instances where the English and Greek vernacular manifest a singular agreement; as a few analogous expressions from the *Anabasis* will shew: viz.:

Ἡ δὲ ὁδὸς ὁδοποιημένη ἦν: (Αναβας: E, § 11.)

Ἐτύγχανε δὲ θώρακα ἔχων τὸν ἵππικον: (Γ, § 25.)

Ἐστὶ ἐν τῇ θαλάττῃ προχέμενον χωρίον: (Z, § 21.)

Καὶ ὅμοιοι ἦσαν θαυμάζοντες: (Γ, § 28.)

But the disposition of the impersonal verb and participle are exactly paralleled in the following passage:—Ἦν δὲ αὕτη ἡ στρατηγία ἐδὲν ἄλλο δυναμένη, ἢ ἀποδράναι, ἢ ἀποφυγεῖν: (Ib.: B., § 7.) Where the *ἦν δυναμένη*, completely answers to the *ἦν ἀρχόμενος* of St. Luke: Καὶ αὐτός ἦν ὁ Ἰησοῦς ὡσεὶ ἐτῶν τριάχοντα ἀρχόμενος.

We find in this author also the very same method of expressing the age of a person, as St. Luke uses—'Ὅτε δὲ ἀπέθνησκεν, ἦν ἐτῶν ὡς τριάκοντα (B, § 28, p. 172).

The word ἀρχόμενος governs a genitive case, and the construction appears quite regular, according to the received translation of it: "that Jesus began, or was beginning, to be about 30 years of age;" he was just entered upon that year of his life.

Taking it to be so, that our Lord was baptized about the end of the year in the consulate of *Gætulicus* and *Sabinus*,—from that time to March in the consulate of the two Gemini is two years and three months, which must have constituted the true period of his ministration. It appears to us that such is the time shewn by St. John's gospel, and very answerable to the accounts in the other gospels, under the guidance of that more distinctly chronological history. We will therefore state in a brief synoptical form the series of events which constitute the gospel history in this order and course of time.

It appears to us, taking the baptism to have occurred on the 1st January, the anniversary of our Lord's circumcision which it superseded, and the temptation to have been entered upon as the octave of that day—the Epiphany—the period of those 40 days would have extended to the 15th February; and allowing the approaching passover that followed his baptism to have occurred in March or April, that interval would satisfy the time of our Lord's visit to Cana and Capernaum, as related by St. John, before that passover. The visit to that passover is distinctly related by St. John; after which it is plain our Lord remained in Judæa, engaged in a baptismal ministry of his own till the following December; when he returned to Galilee on John Baptist's imprisonment, and commenced his ministry there, probably about the Epiphany. It was on his return out of Judæa on that occasion that he rested at Jacob's well, and had the conversation with the Samaritan woman. It was also during that abode in Judæa in that baptism, that he held the conversation with Nicodemus upon the doctrine of regeneration.

On this return to Galilee he performed his second miracle at Cana, by the cure of the nobleman's son. The works spoken of by the Galilæans in their admiration of him during his visit at Jerusalem, are not spoken of as miracles but *wonders*, and refer to the effects produced by his conduct and preaching: this is plainly to be shewn. In that visit he gained the admiration of all men, and there was no conspiring against him; it was only after John's arrest, that the jealousy of the priesthood and government were directed towards him. After a few weeks'

stay in Galilee he returned to Jerusalem to "a feast;"—not named, but mentioned by St. John in his fifth chapter, and generally considered to be a passover. To ourselves, it appears plainly not a passover, since St. John always speaks of the passover Feast by its name. Standing between the winter season when he went back to Galilee, and the passover season when he fed the five thousand, it appears plainly to refer to the feast of Purim, which preceded the passover exactly a month. In this visit our Lord first opened his lips as to his own divine character: he had before been content to be called a prophet, he now first declared himself the Son of God; he healed the impotent man at the pool of Bethesda on the sabbath-day, and the cured man treated the Jews' reproaches with contempt; "therefore the Jews persecuted Jesus because he had done these things on the sabbath: and when he said, 'My Father worketh and I work,' they sought the more to kill him because he also said that God was his Father." His reference to John on this occasion indicates that he was still alive. The whole of this fifth chapter of St. John appears to relate to that visit, in which our Lord stirred up the animosity of the priesthood; who followed him by their emissaries into Galilee, and there watched his proceedings. As the baptismal ministry in Judæa obtained a general favour, so that the disciples of John said that all men flocked to him, there is no way of accounting for the appearance of the priestly emissaries about our Lord's steps in Galilee, and their attempt to waylay and entangle him, but by this second visit and the new and surprising character our Lord then assumed. His known association with the Baptist, against whom Herod had taken a violent prejudice as a dangerous and seditious person, probably gave a public character to this persecution.

On this return to Galilee, no doubt he entered upon the full course of his great ministry there. Then began the abundance of his miracles in that region, which continued probably several weeks, till the death of John and the approach of the passover; when he withdrew the multitude to the wilderness, and performed that most eminent of all his miracles—the feeding of the five thousand with the five loaves and two fishes. It does not appear to us that our Lord attended that passover in Jerusalem. That miracle may have served as its substituted feast, the type of the true passover, which was to be celebrated in the following year; when his body, the bread that came down from heaven, was to be broken and distributed to all kingdoms and nations. Before this he had probably made one of his detours through the nearest towns of his own region of Galilee; after it, he made his great journey to the borders of Tyre and Sidon and round

by Nazareth and Sarepta, where he raised the widow's son; and having again reached the mountains about the Sea of Galilee, near Tiberias, there he fed the four thousand. Then he crossed that sea to the opposite coast, and progressed through Bethsaida to the sources of the Jordan, the mountainous regions of Cæsarea Philippi; where it is evident his transfiguration took place. In that progress, which may have occupied several weeks, he was proclaimed the Christ by the faith of St. Peter; and after his transfiguration he began to foretell the end of his mission. From that point his mind was bent upon a return to Jerusalem; and he came back to Capernaum, where he bade Peter cast in a hook for the fish in whose mouth was found the tribute-money. He remained in Galilee a few weeks after this, and returned towards Jerusalem for the feast of tabernacles—about the middle of September. He continued in Jerusalem, probably lodging at the village of Bethany with the family of Lazarus, from this feast to December; during which time he was constantly in and about Jerusalem, and disputing with the doctors and teaching the people. At the feast of the dedication these disputes grew so high, and the enemies of our Lord became so fierce, that he fled to Bethabara beyond Jordan, where John first baptized; and thither he was followed by great multitudes and executed, as it seems to us, a distinct mission in that region. This ministry is only slightly referred to by St. Matthew and St. Mark.

The doctrines of this division begin with the question on divorce, and most of St. Luke's narratives relate to the events of this period. Probably from hence also the seventy disciples were sent forth, as the twelve had been in Galilee.

From this ministry our Lord was called towards Jerusalem again by the death of Lazarus, and he reached Bethany; but his enemies again beset him and he fled to Ephraim, a city of the wilderness, to conceal himself. The precise time of the ministry at Bethabara cannot be told; it probably continued till about a month before the passover of the ensuing year.

The ministry of our Lord, therefore, lasted by this course two years and three months from his baptism; and one year and three months from his going into Galilee, after the ministry in Judæa and his conversation at Jacob's well with the Samaritan woman: and the consular lists shew that it is impossible to have been of longer duration. He began his ministry at 29 full years of age, and finished it at the age of 31 years and 3 months.

This may appear insufficient in point of time, for such a work as the establishment of the Gospel in the world; but it was a divine work, and Christ determined its period in one of its divisions, by designating it "the acceptable year." Whether that

applied to the year he spent in his baptismal ministry in Judæa, or the period he spent in Galilee, is not clear. The miracles that are related in the Gospel are a small section only of those he performed, which were done in multitudes; and of those of St. Matthew, half the number recounted are the fruits of two or three days only. It is plain the time is abundant for all that is related; and it was the common opinion of the early Church that his ministry was not of longer duration. Epiphanius says it continued only one year, probably from the fact that one year completed the period of each of his ministries. Origen says it did not continue three years;ⁱ and in fact, it is impossible it should be more, if the consular lists of the Augustan era can be depended upon; whose accuracy we do not believe can be effectually impeached.

The "*independent opinions*" of writers of all ages upon these dates are perfectly astounding; but they generally proceed upon some isolated question, and being *independently* argued, they run into all manner of counter directions. Among these independent questions, there are three which bear upon this chronology, and have been argued into difficulties; viz., the time of the death of Herod, our Lord's age at his baptism, and the period of the visit of the wise men to Bethlehem.

The two first we have already considered; but we have reserved the last to a separate division of our paper, because a contributor to the *J. S. L.* of the last number but one (April, 1857) proposes a new view on that subject, which we wish to review. His suggestion is, that the adoration of the magi took place at Nazareth, and not at Bethlehem; and if we admit that the argument has some ingenuity in it, it does not nevertheless appear to us to be supported, or the authorities quite candidly brought forward. As an instance on the latter point, J. L. B. omits that very important recital, that occurs after the eastern visitors had been examined about their errand at Jerusalem, and the prophecies had been consulted as to the place where Messiah was to be born; that "then Herod sent the wise men to Bethlehem and said; Go and search diligently for the child, and when ye have found him bring me word; and when they had heard the king they departed, and the star went before them." Now we hold it to be quite impossible, that the direction of this visit could have been changed from Bethlehem to some other city by these messengers of the king, without some notice being taken of the change by the historian; for St. Matthew begins this very narrative by setting forth that, "when Jesus was born

ⁱ *Contra Cels.*, l. ii.

in Bethlehem of Judæa," the event happened which he is about to relate,—that event having special relation to the town of Bethlehem, and being recorded in a way to shew to all common apprehensions, that it had its issue in the very place proposed in the commencing paragraph. Is it not clear, if this preface intended to refer to an event which was to be accomplished at Nazareth, the evangelist would never have pointed the finger of expectation to another place? On the return out of Egypt, we think again that J. L. B. should have put the passage more prominently forward, which says that, "when Herod was dead, and the angel had warned Joseph that he might go again into the land of Israel, because they were dead which sought the young child's life; when Joseph heard that Archelaus did reign *"in Judæa"* in the room of his father Herod, *he was afraid to go thither.*" It is plain therefore *his proposed return* had reference to Judæa and not to Galilee, which it would have referred to, if he had gone to Egypt from that place. Joseph did not direct his steps at once to Nazareth, but "*turned aside* into the parts of Galilee" (Matt. ii. 22). We should have commented a little more particularly upon the uselessness also of a warning to Joseph to flee from Nazareth, when Herod's fury was directed to Bethlehem; but that J. L. B. notices the inconsistency himself in a note at the end of his paper. But we think his answer wholly insufficient to the supposed objection on this point; which is, that though Herod's wrath was directed to Bethlehem, a rumour might have arisen, "come floating," to the neighbourhood of Nazareth, "and the neighbours would begin to wonder whose family Herod aimed at: there is a rumour that certain magi came from the east, who went to seek out a *certain child*, and went away home again without telling Herod where they found the child, or whether they found him at all: is it not evident, supposing Herod's life prolonged, and Joseph abiding at Nazareth after the slaughter at Bethlehem, that no danger could be greater than what, in that case, threatened the safety of the holy child Jesus?" We candidly confess we cannot see the danger; we should have thought him perfectly safe among his kinsfolk and parents' acquaintance. But our contributor seems to forget that the warning and flight was "God's warning," not a mere act of human prudence. God foresaw that the fierce king would perpetrate a massacre in Bethlehem, not at Nazareth; and the child being at Bethlehem, he sent his angel to warn Joseph of the coming evil, and to fly into Egypt. It would be the strangest overcaution that ever happened in this world or out of it, if the foreknowledge of the Most High should have foreseen the slaughter at Bethlehem, and yet sent an angel

to remove the child from Nazareth, where the same foreknowledge would have known no slaughter was to happen, as the facts of the case shew.

As to the often controverted question about the time of the wise men's arrival at Jerusalem, and of their previous seeing of the star in their own country, we hope we shall not appear presumptuous, if we say that it has always appeared quite clear to ourselves that the star was seen in the east, at the *incarnation* of Christ and not at his birth; that is, on the day of the annunciation or 25th March, preceding his birth. This, besides agreeing better with the written account, will be found to reconcile all the difficulties in the history itself. We subjoin the Greek of St. Matthew's account, because his words indicate a difference between the time of the conception and the birth, and he applies the appearance of the star to the former; *Τῷ δὲ Ἰησοῦ γεννηθέντος ἐν Βεθλεὲμ, ἰδοὺ, Μάγοι ἀπὸ ἀνατολῶν παραγένοντο εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα, λέγοντες· που ἐστὶν ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰωδαίων; εἶδομεν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸν ἀστέρα ἐν τῇ ἀνατολῇ, καὶ ἦλθομεν προσκυνῆσαι αὐτῷ* (chap. ii. 1). The two words may be convertible, but it is plain they are used to distinguish the events; and that if the word *γεννηθέντος* is that which St. Matthew uses for "*the birth*," the word *ὁ τεχθεὶς* must apply to the other event, the "*generation*" of the child, and the period of the virgin's conception. It shews also, that the title took its origin from the nature of the conception, as it ought to do; and that the star manifested the coming of the Shiloh into his fleshly tabernacle; as again it seems suitable should be the case.

The discrepancies on this subject are necessarily as numerous as the opinions about the interval between the birth of our Lord and the death of Herod. Macknight assumes that interval to have been above a twelvemonth, and accounts for Joseph and Mary being found at Bethlehem, when the wise men arrived there a year after the nativity, by supposing a second visit from Nazareth, and so reconciling the account with that given by St. Luke of their immediate return to Nazareth after the purification; but this is a plain distortion of both histories, for St. Matthew plainly speaks of one visit only to Bethlehem, and St. Luke of one return only to Nazareth for the abode of the Saviour's youth and subjection to his parents. Thus Macknight makes the slaughter extend up to the full age of two years in the victim children, supposing the star to have been seen in their own country when the birth took place.*

It appears to us that St Matthew's account plainly marks

* Macknight, *Commentary*, § 2; Foot note.

the time of the wise men's arrival in Jerusalem, by the time of the birth of the child. He says, "Jesus being born at Bethlehem, behold wise men from the East came to Jerusalem;"—surely at or about the period of the event that is set as the mark of this coming. The notion of a second visit to Bethlehem can hardly be supported; for the first visit is shewn to have been purely one of necessity and accidental, and so little provided for that the family were left without any proper abode: it could hardly be that a second accidental call could have happened to take them to so inhospitable a town. Dr. Valpy, in his edition of the Greek Testament, differs from Macknight *in toto*, and says that St. Luke's account of the return to Nazareth refers to the final return of the family there, and the non-statement of the intervening events is an intentional omission, as being related by others. He holds also that the age of the infants slain, ἀπὸ διετῆς καὶ κατωτέρω, does not mean from two years old and under, but from the second year and under; meaning such children as had fully attained one year, and were entered upon the second. This he supports from Hesychius and other Greek authorities, in a way which leaves no doubt of the correctness of that view.¹ What strikes ourselves is, that the visit happened at the very time of the birth, and had been "*computed from the appearance of the star*," which appeared nine months before; and was known to be the star of the incarnation or conception of the expected king—the 25th March. The vision of angels which appeared to the shepherds at the birth, has been supposed to have shone forth as that star; and those who think this may transfer their creed to the angel who visited Mary at the annunciation. It is clear, the visit of the Magi was at that time that Herod's complaints were become serious, and when he was probably at the baths of Callirhoe, and undergoing the last painful discipline for his complicated disorders. Supposing then that they arrived on the 25th December, as the day they expected the birth, their first proceeding would certainly have been a silent expectation of some public eclat on the happening of a great national and expected event; having probably expected to find the infant in some royal birth of the reigning family. Then they would have commenced enquiries about this prophetic king, at first with little attention, till it came to the ears of Herod. Such a process must have occupied some time before the rumours of their arrival reached Herod at Callirhoe, and stirred up his apprehensions. Then would be the debate in what way to act to discover the new king, and the course adopted upon

¹ Valpy, *Greek Testament*, note Matt. ii. 16.

debate and council, to further the strangers in their object, and pursue it upon their discovery of it. Then would be the commission to the scribes and doctors to investigate the Sacred Books, and determine in what quarter the new king was to be born; which, like all Government commissions, would have occupied time in the necessary deliberation and discussion between the learned investigators. It cannot be doubted that all this kind of necessary preliminary must have occupied several weeks; and it is impossible not to connect those inquiries with the circumstance of the child's recognition and worship in the temple at the visit of the purification. At that time, the 2nd February, Herod who died in March, and occupied the last month at Jericho in those furious machinations, by which he determined to celebrate his approaching death; and for which he had sent into all parts of his dominions summonses to his principal men to attend him, and who did attend him at Jericho, must have been in the very paroxysm of his rising fury: and after sending the wise men on their mission to Bethlehem expressly, and ordering them to return to him with an account of their discovery, and finding they did not return, he probably ordered the execution of the children in the very same fit, in which he charged his daughter Salome to put the senators whom he had imprisoned in his palace to death, as soon as he was dead. Taking it to be that he died soon after the 25th March, which, as the passover that year was on the 12th April, might have been, his order to kill the children of a twelvemonth old would have concurred with the time the star was first seen by the wise men, which was the 25th March of the antecedent year; and a slaughter of all of full one year to that date would make sure of the object. This would be the result of a suspicion, that though the wise men held the appearance of the star to indicate the conception of the child, it might have designated its birth at the time when it was seen. The slaughter of all children born on that previous 25th March or afterwards down to the time of the execution, must therefore have been effectual.

The "*diligent enquiry*" Herod made to ascertain the precise time of the star's appearance from the magi; and the reference to that time, in his regulation of the class of infants to be slain; that χρόνον ὃν ἠκρίβωσε παρὰ τῶν μάγων, shews that he was guided by his apprehensions in the period he assigned; since, if the star had appeared only at the coming of the wise men to Jerusalem, it is difficult to understand what the ἠκρίβωσε could mean; for the point must have been a very plain one and the age of the infant certain.

Hitcham Rectory,
20th June, 1857.

H. M. G.

**HISTORY OF THE SABBATH UNDER THE OLD TESTAMENT
DISPENSATION; ITS DIVINE ORIGIN AND
UNIVERSAL OBLIGATION.**

IN discussing the general question of the sabbatic institution, it is of the highest moment, in order to our entertaining correct views on the subject, to determine whether it rests on divine or on human authority,—whether it be of God or of man. If God has appointed the Sabbath day, and commanded man to observe it as a day of holy rest, this fact virtually settles many of the controversies to which the subject has given rise, and makes plain before us the whole path of duty regarding it. Our appeal therefore must at once be made to the “Law and to the testimony.”

It cannot be disputed that the day of Sabbath rest was observed by the Jews under the ancient economy; and all who believe in the divine origin of the laws and institutions of that economy, must acknowledge that the Jewish Sabbath was appointed by Jehovah. But the question here presents itself for solution,—a question embodying the entire controversy regarding the moral obligation of the Sabbath—Was the Sabbath originated under the Jewish economy? Did its obligation commence when the law was given to the Jews in the wilderness, or did it exist from the beginning of the world?

We read in the history of the creation that when God had finished the heavens and the earth, and all the host of them, “*he rested on the seventh day from all his work which he had made. And God blessed the seventh day and sanctified it*” (Gen. ii. 2, 3). These words supply an explicit answer to this question. They contain the history of the first Sabbath. They plainly intimate to us that the day was divinely set apart at the beginning of the world—two thousand years, at least, before a Jew was born. No sooner had God formed the heavens and the earth, and placed Adam in the garden of Eden, than he blessed and consecrated one day in seven for his own service; he blessed the seventh day and sanctified it. A peculiar eminence and distinction above all the other days of the week is here ascribed to the seventh day. God blessed *it*. He blessed it by connecting inestimable blessings with the due observance of it; by making it in a special manner the season for conferring on man his choicest blessings. It was sanctified or set apart as a day of holy rest; a day to be devoted to the joyful and devout contemplation of the Creator’s works, and of the perfections of his

character, his wisdom, power and goodness, which they display. The Sabbath was graciously appointed for man, as a day to be devoted to the worship and praise of the Creator—exercises the noblest in which it is possible for man to engage, and which, when entered upon with a right heart and in the spirit of devout reverence and filial trust, diffuse an ineffable peace and joy over the soul, and elevating the mind above the world and all its cares, impart a foretaste of the bliss of heaven. The Sabbath

“was blessed to be made a blessing. It was a boon to man; not for man of particular circumstances and classes and climates—but for generic, universal man. It is as much to each as to all. It is the charter of poverty, the shield of helplessness. It is the bow of promise, the anchor of hope. Its ray pierces the prison and lightens the sullen brow of quiet; it enters the dwelling of desolation, and draws the widow’s eye to heaven. It is the best advantage and immunity of man. It is the respite of toil, the lull of strife, the down of weariness, the balm of woe. What has ever tended so to prolong life, to raise civilization, to refine character, to excite reflection, to bind society, to cheer labour, to honour virtue, to repress exactions, to quicken liberty, to consolidate religion? The original blessing breathes around it still, it is a ‘delight.’ ‘God *sanctified* the seventh day.’ That ‘hallowing’ was its authentic consecration. It separated it from the common use to that which is religious. There is no religion without worship. This is the peculiar designation of the season. Divine worship among socialized man requires social agreement, admits of mutual instruction, and diffuses the most salutary influence through even every civil relation.”^a

God sanctified the Sabbath day by separating it from the other days of labour, and setting it apart to be spent by man in exercises wholly of a religious nature.

In the words of the sacred historian, quoted above (Gen. ii. 1—3), there is not, properly speaking, a direct commandment given to man to keep the Sabbath holy. The Sabbath is not enacted as a law. God does not formally command Adam to rest on that day, and to remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy; but he himself rests on that day, blesses it and sanctifies it. Though there is not here given an express commandment regarding the Sabbath, yet the principle of the Sabbath is revealed, as expressive of the divine will for man’s guidance. God’s working six days and resting on the seventh; his dividing the work of creation into six portions, followed by a seventh of rest, was not necessary as regards himself. He did not need to extend his work over the space of six days, and then rest on the seventh day for his own sake. His example, in this matter, was

^a *Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, by R. W. Hamilton, pp. 10, 11.

doubtless designed to teach man the proportions of time to be severally devoted to his own employment, and to the service and worship of God; to teach man that after six days' work we are to rest on the seventh, and sanctify that day, keeping it holy to the Lord. The whole work of creation might have been completed by God in an instant; but he adopted this peculiar order of work and rest, that man might imitate his example. He distributed his work over six days and rested on the seventh, to fix for all time the grand principle, that after six days of labour there should be one of religious rest. The Sabbath, then, not only holds a place among divinely appointed institutions, but is set forth in the new creative order of the universe, and associated with those displays of the creator's glory which awakened the song of angels—the shout of joy from the “sons of *God*.” It is a day specially glorious; “the queen of days,” appointed at the morning of the world's existence, and destined to last while sun and moon endure. The Sabbath is altogether independent of all the dispensations of religion which God has revealed. Made known before any of the other commandments given to man, and not contingent on any of the revolutions or changes that may occur in this world, it will continue to bless and gladden man, and to shed its hallowed radiance along the whole pathway of his earthly career, till the Sabbath of earth shall merge into the Sabbath of heaven.

The law of the Sabbath holds a place among the divine institutions parallel to that of the law of marriage. As an inference from what God had done for Adam in forming Eve to be his companion, it is said, “Therefore shall a man leave his father and his mother, and shall cleave unto his wife; and they shall be one flesh” (Gen. ii. 24). This is the general principle arising out of the fact that God made for Adam a help meet for him. This principle, though forgotten and disregarded in patriarchal times, when polygamy prevailed, still continued unchangeable in its nature and in its obligation upon man. When our Lord was appealed to regarding the nature of the marriage bond, he referred at once to the original principle on which the marriage-union was founded, and asked those who appealed to him, “Have ye not read that he which made them at the beginning, made them male and female? For this cause shall a man leave his father and mother, and shall cleave to his wife; and they twain shall be one flesh.” This one principle thus revealed in paradise is immutable and invariable. In the same way are we to regard the principle of the Sabbath as revealed to us in the recorded fact that God rested on the seventh day, and blessed and sanctified it. The principle of the Sabbath as thus revealed

has all the force of a law, though not formally expressed; just as God's creating for Adam one wife revealed a principle which was designed to be a law to mankind in all subsequent time. The creator continued his work till the whole was finished, and rested after six days of labour to shew that the interval between one day's rest and another should be six days. It was not that express day he appointed and blessed as the Sabbath and no other, but *the* seventh day, every seventh day, a seventh portion of time.

The Sabbath is not man's day, it is God's. It is a day benevolently and wisely adapted to the necessities of man, both temporally and spiritually. It is a day holy unto God for man's use and blessing. Though Adam was in a state of innocence, the all-wise Creator saw it necessary to call him from the duties required in dressing the garden and keeping it, to one day's rest in seven; a day to be spent in the special contemplation of the Creator's glory, and in the exercises of his worship. Adam was still undefiled by sin, when God appointed to him the Sabbath. Unlike his posterity, his soul did not cleave unto the dust, and he needed not the Sabbath as we now do to refresh his body, wearied with excessive toil, and to stimulate his soul in the exercises of adoration and of praise, yet that day of sacred repose was necessary for him even in innocence. There is something pleasing in the recollection of the fact that the first day man spent on earth was a Sabbath. No sooner was man formed, capable of viewing with intelligence and with reverent and adoring wonder the grandeur of creation, and its displays of the Creator's glory, than a day was specially set apart for that end. The Sabbath was thus made for man as man. It rests on the primary relation he sustains to God as his Creator.

The only plausible evasion of the force of this passage (Gen. ii. 3), as an historical testimony to the appointment of the primeval Sabbath, is that which regards it as proleptical or anticipatory of the subsequent institution of the day, recorded in Exodus. This mode of explaining the narrative was first adopted by Tostatus, and after him by Bramhall, Barrow, Heylin, Paley, and many others. It is asserted that the Sabbath was not known till it was given to the Jews on their journey through the wilderness, and that when mentioned in the beginning of Genesis, the historian takes notice of it only incidentally. Thus Paley says:

“As the seventh day was erected into a Sabbath on account of God's resting on that day from the work of creation, it was natural enough in the historian, when he had related the history of the creation, and of God's ceasing from it on the seventh day, to add, ‘And God blessed the Sabbath day, and sanctified it, because that on it he had rested from all

his work, which the Lord God created and made:’ although the blessing and sanctification, *i. e.*, the religious distinction and appropriation of the day was not actually made for many ages afterwards. The words do not assert that God *then* blessed and sanctified the seventh day, but that he blessed and sanctified it *for that reason*. And if any ask why the Sabbath or sanctification of the seventh day was *then* mentioned, if it was not *then* appointed, the answer is at hand; the order of connexion, not of time, introduced the mention of the Sabbath in the history of the subject which it was ordained to commemorate.”^b

The decision of the question thus raised settles the whole controversy regarding the permanent and universal obligation of the Sabbath day. Was the Sabbath set apart at the time when first mentioned by Moses; that is, in immediate connexion with the finishing of the work of creation? If so, then, beyond doubt, the Sabbath is of permanent and universal obligation. Paley acknowledges this. He says—

“If the divine command was actually delivered at the creation, it was addressed no doubt to the whole human species alike, and continues, unless repealed by some subsequent revelation, binding upon all who come to the knowledge of it. If the command was published for the first time in the wilderness, then it was directed to the Jewish people alone; and something farther, either in the subject or circumstances of the command, will be necessary to shew that it was designed for any other. . . . The former opinion precludes all debate about the extent of the obligation; the latter admits, and, *prima facie*, induces a belief that the Sabbath ought to be considered as part of the peculiar law of the Jewish policy.”

The opinion that the words of Genesis ii. 3 are proleptical is wholly without foundation. Such an idea could never occur to an unprejudiced reader of the sacred narrative. The plain and obvious meaning of the record would certainly lead an unbiassed mind to the conclusion that what Moses says of the Sabbath actually took place at the time mentioned; namely, on the seventh day of creation. The transactions of the seventh day are recorded in the same manner as are those of the sixth or of the fifth, and they are recorded as having occurred at the time. We may with just as much plausibility aver that the events of the sixth, or of the fifth, or of any of the other days of creation, are recorded by anticipation of what took place ages afterwards, as that the events of the seventh day are recorded by anticipation. Each day’s work is mentioned in its own order. As the events of each of the six days are recorded, so also are those of the seventh day. On the seventh day God rested from all his work, and “blessed and sanctified it.” This is a plain historical

^b *Moral Philosophy*, book v.

narrative, recording a series of successive acts, and if we are not to believe that the events really occurred as they are reported to have occurred, then there is an end to all faith in the accuracy of the Scripture records.

Moreover, if the Sabbath was instituted to commemorate God's work of creation, then it must necessarily date its origin from the time when that work to be commemorated was completed. The passover was instituted to commemorate the deliverance of the Jews from the destroying angel in the land of Egypt, and as was to be expected, it began to be celebrated from the date of that deliverance. This was the case also with the commemorative institution of the Lord's Supper. They began to be observed at the time, and thus became memorials of the events to which they referred. If the Sabbath was designed as a memorial of the great work of creation, it cannot be supposed that the appointment of it was delayed till two thousand years after that work was finished. The Sabbath

"was intended to be not only a chronicle, but a visible attestation, a living action, proving and signifying that God was the Creator of all things. It was to be a protest against the eternity of matter, the fortuitous concourse of atoms, the self-generation of life, and every heathen cosmogony. But any monumental custom must commence at the period from the work which it avouches. It derives all its authority of proof out of its coëtaneousness. Then the pillar must be raised. Then must the die be struck. A distant beginning of a testimony to some early fact, would be its dishonour and falsification. If the Sabbath originated in the wilderness the creation is depreciated as a myth: if ever since creation Sabbaths have succeeded each other, then was it a fact."^c

But it has been said,

"If the Sabbath had been instituted at the time of the creation, as the words in Genesis may seem at first sight to import, and if it had been observed all along from that time to the departure of the Jews out of Egypt, a period of about two thousand five hundred years; it appears unaccountable that no mention of it, no occasion of even the obscurest allusion to it, should occur either in the general history of the world before the call of Abraham, which contains we admit only a few memoirs of its early ages, and those extremely abridged; or which is more to be wondered at, in that of the lives of the first three Jewish patriarchs, which in many parts of the account is sufficiently circumstantial and domestic."^d

In tracing the history of the Sabbath through the antediluvian and the patriarchal times, we must consider the brevity of

^c Hamilton's *Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 15.

^d Paley's *Moral Philosophy*, book v.

the Scripture record, containing only the more remarkable events and transactions, and affording but few opportunities of direct reference to the Sabbath. Even granting to our opponents that there are to be found no traces of the primitive Sabbath, it will not necessarily follow that the Sabbath was not instituted at the beginning of the world's history. From the death of Moses till the time of the prophet Amos, that is, for a period of about six hundred and forty years, we find no references whatever to the Sabbath day in Scripture history. But this long silence no one will allege against the fact that the Sabbath law was delivered from Sinai. If silence in the one case is not an argument against the existence of the Sabbath, neither can it be so in the other. If during a period of more than six hundred years, of whose history we have seven entire books, no mention is made of the Sabbath, though we know that during all that period it was carefully observed, what can we argue from a similar silence extending over a period of above two thousand years, of which we have only one historical book, which contains not the history of one nation alone but of the world itself?

We find no mention made of sacrifices for a period of about fifteen hundred years,—from the time of Seth to the deluge, nor for a period of similar duration,—from the time of the entrance of the Jews into Canaan till the advent of Christ, do we meet with any references to the existence of the rite of circumcision, yet no one will conclude from this silence on the part of the Scripture narratives, that sacrifices were not offered, or that circumcision was not regularly observed by the Jews during these periods.

Even though amid the general corruption succeeding the fall of man, the original law of the Sabbath had been lost or disregarded; even though the Sabbath actually ceased to be observed during the period mentioned, this would in no way injure the argument founded on Genesis ii. 3, that it was instituted in Paradise. The law of marriage was lost during a longer period, and was practically disregarded by the Jews. Yet *our* Saviour asserted its primary appointment in Paradise, and its perpetually binding obligation (Matt. xix. 4, 5).

The objection deduced from the alleged silence of Scripture, regarding the keeping of the Sabbath from the time of Adam till Moses, can be regarded as of no force whatever.

But in point of fact, it is not true that Scripture is silent regarding the keeping of the Sabbath during the primitive ages of the world. There are frequent and undoubted indications, both in Scripture and in profane history, of the existence of the Sabbatic institution from the earliest times.

The first recorded act of divine worship after the fall, affords indications of a special day having been set apart for the service of God. Cain and Abel (Gen. iv. 3), mutually brought their offerings to the Lord, *in the process of time*, or literally in the *end of the days*. Their thus coming together for the purposes of worship would, of itself, give rise to the supposition that the time at which they jointly engaged in this service, was an appointed one,—a regular stated time recognized by both of them. Had the day not been one set apart for the worship of God, Cain, who cherished no love toward his brother Abel, would not voluntarily have chosen to be associated with him on that occasion. They offered their sacrifices “*at the end of the days*.” On the supposition of the existence of the Sabbath, this reference to the time is easily understood, as meaning the last of the seven days,—the day which God had blessed and sanctified. Only one manner of dividing time into periods of days had yet been mentioned—the division into weeks; we may therefore reasonably entertain the idea, that the day on which Cain and Abel came together to present their respective offerings, was the seventh day which God had set apart to be a holy Sabbath to himself.

We are afterwards informed, that at the birth of Enos, when his father Seth was one hundred and five years old, “men began to call upon the name of the Lord.” This cannot mean that there was no private worship of the Lord till the birth of Enos. Adam was now two hundred and thirty five years old. It cannot be believed that either he or Seth had lived all that time without private prayer. The passage can only mean, as indeed the exact import of the original Hebrew words here used, apart from all other considerations would lead us to conclude,^e that when Enos was born, that is, when men began to multiply, then they began to worship God in a social and public manner. But such worship can only be conducted where there are fixed and stated times for that purpose.

There are evident traces of the existence of the Sabbath at the time of the flood. The Lord said unto Noah, “Yet *seven days*, and I will cause it to rain upon the earth,”—and the historian says, “it came to pass after *seven days*, that the waters of

^e “Gen. iv. 26: ‘Then began men to call,’ etc.; or ‘then was a commencement made of calling,’ etc., is rightly translated. The phrase לִקְרָא בִשְׁמֵי יְהוָה (likra beshem Yehovah) means *invocation upon the name of God*, and this in a *social* and *public* manner (compare Gen. xii. 8; xiii. 4; xxi. 33; xxvi. 25; Ps. cv. 1; Is. xii. 4; xli. 25). It can mean neither less nor more here, as I think, than that public *social* worship then commenced, *i. e.*, so soon as men began to multiply. The writer does not mean to intimate that the pious Seth did not *pray* before his son was born to him; what can he intimate but social worship? *When*—is not said.” *Moses Stuart*, of Andover.

the flood were upon the earth." When the flood is decreasing, Noah sends out a dove which returns again, for the waters were on the face of the whole earth. "And he stayed yet other *seven days*, and again he sent forth the dove, and the dove came in to him in the evening." "And he stayed yet other *seven days*, and sent forth the dove" the third time, when it returned not. The supposition is in the highest degree probable, that these several seventh days, so specially noticed, were the appointed and consecrated Sabbaths of each week.

"When the second father of our race sent forth the raven from the ark, why tarried he *seven* days before he sent forth the dove?^f And when this messenger returned, why other seven days before he sent her forth the second time? And other seven again when she came back with the symbol of peace, ere he gave her her third and final dismissal? Why seven rather than six, or eight, or ten? Why, but because the interval was a week. And the supposition is as pleasing as it is probable, that these winged scouts were sent out on the Sabbath, the day of holy rest, on which from the little company in the ark, the only living remnant of a desolated world, the worship of praise and prayer ascended to the God of judgment and of mercy; when they bowed to his awful vengeance, and cast themselves on his gracious and mighty protection."^g

Again, when we descend to the times of the patriarchs, we find the plainest evidences that the method of reckoning time by periods of seven days, was in common use. There we read of Jacob serving his "*week*," first for Leah, and then for Rachel. When Jacob died, Joseph "made a mourning for his father *seven days*." When Job's three friends came to comfort him in his affliction, "they sat down with him upon the ground, *seven days and seven nights*." During the patriarchal age, as well as subsequently, the number *seven* frequently occurs in the account of the religious arrangements and observances of the people. Thus, the token of Abraham's covenant with Abimelech, was "*seven* ewe lambs." The sacrifice Job offered for his friends, was "*seven* bullocks and seven rams." Balaam^h of Mesopotamia, the country of Abraham, when he offered sacrifices at the desire of the King of Moab, with the view of bringing a curse upon Israel, erected every time he offered sacrifice, *seven* altars, and offered upon each altar, *seven* bullocks and *seven* rams.

"Is there not in this," says Jordan, "so remarkable a coincidence

^f When Noah sent forth the dove the second time it is said, "He stayed yet *other seven days*," plainly intimating that seven days had elapsed between the time of his sending forth the raven and his sending forth the dove for the first time.

^g Wardlaw on the Sabbath, p. 22.

^h Abraham had left Mesopotamia at least four hundred and thirty years before the events here referred to.

with Abraham's peace-offering to Abimelech, of seven ewe lambs, as plainly to indicate a common origin of such a use of the number seven, and that long previous to the giving of the commandments, and so an evidence of a traditionary knowledge of the Sabbath and its primitive institution."ⁱ

It cannot be doubted then that during the patriarchal ages the division of time into weeks, or periods of seven days, was in common use. But how can that peculiar and altogether artificial mode of dividing time be accounted for, except on the theory of the existence of the Sabbatic institution? This method of reckoning time is not natural like the division of time into months or years. It is purely conventional. How then came it into existence, and why was it so universally adopted? The only satisfactory answer can be that God "rested on the seventh day, and sanctified it." The existence of the division of time into weeks implies a knowledge of the reasons of that division. Time was so divided by God for special ends; and seeing this remarkable division of time was known from the beginning, the purposes for which it was made must also have been known, and the sabbath held sacred as the day on which God rested from all his works which he had created and made. "The original and only week which we find recorded did contain the Sabbath; we cannot allow then, without precise information, a week that does not. It belongs to its idea. It is an integral part of its compass."

This hebdomadal division of time can be traced among all nations, from the earliest periods to which tradition or history reaches. It is not confined to those tribes whose history is recorded in Scripture, but was well known among nations ignorant of the oracles of God.

At the confusion of tongues in the plains of Shinar, the sons of Noah with their families seem to have gone forth in different directions to take possession of the world. Japheth and his family went toward Armenia. He was followed by Shem, who compelled him to press onward and to enter Europe, while he and his family settled around Mount Ararat. Ham and his descendants went down to Canaan, and afterwards to Egypt and Africa. And thus, from these three different families, was the whole earth, in process of time, again peopled. Among each of these divisions of the human race, we find the same tradition of the Sabbatic institute. "We find, from time immemorial, the use of this period (of seven days) among all nations, without any variation in the form of it. The Israelites, Assyrians,

ⁱ Jordan's *Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God*, p. 121.

Egyptians, Indians, Arabians, and, in a word, all the nations of the East, have in all ages made use of a week consisting of seven days. We find the same custom among the ancient Romans, Gauls, Britons, Germans, the nations of the North and of America." Josephus, the celebrated Jewish historian, says, "There is not any city of the Grecians, nor any of the barbarians, nor any nation whatsoever, whither our custom of resting on the seventh day hath not come."† The Gentiles despised and hated the Jews, and it was most unlikely that they would adopt from them the practice of keeping the seventh day as a festival day. The Jewish law, moreover, purposely excluded the Gentiles from a participation in their peculiar privileges. The fact of the universal observance of the seventh-day festival, after the manner of the Sabbath, can therefore be accounted for only on the supposition of the existence of an ancient tradition descended from a common origin. Such a division of time is, as we have seen, not a natural one, but must have arisen from some arrangement prescribed by a universally recognized authority,—an authority giving forth its decrees ere the human family were scattered from the plains of Shinar. The traditionary knowledge of the antediluvian world was preserved in the family of Noah, and carried with them when they wandered abroad over the earth, and hence the remains of these traditions are found to be the same in every nation,—they point to a common origin, and, in the case of the Sabbath, corroborate the Mosaic narrative regarding its primeval appointment.‡

It is a curious and an interesting fact, that amid the general forgetfulness of God, and the fearful degeneracy and moral corruption that prevailed in our world, remembrances of the sanctity of the seventh day never wholly perished from among the nations. Deny the existence of the primeval Sabbath, and it will be difficult, if not altogether impossible, to account for these records and relics of antiquity which so plainly testify to the existence of the hebdomadal division of time among all nations, and which attach a peculiar importance to the number seven, and a sacredness to the seventh day: admit the divine appointment of the Sabbath on the seventh day of creation, and all these traditions are easily interpreted in harmony with the Mosaic record.

When we come down to the time of the Exodus, we find, from the manner in which the Sabbath is there referred to, that

† Against Appian, book ii.

‡ See this subject illustrated at length by Jordan, in chap. vi. of his *Scriptural Views of the Sabbath of God*; also by Grotius in his *Truth of the Christian Religion*.

it was an institution well known to the Jews before the giving of the law at Sinai. From Exod. xvi. we learn, that in the course of their wanderings the Hebrews came to the wilderness of Zin, on the fifteenth day of the second month after coming out of Egypt. The law was not given at Sinai till the third day of the third month, that is, eighteen days after they came to Zin. As soon as the people had encamped at Zin, they began to murmur on account of the want of bread. God promises them bread, saying to Moses, "Behold, I will rain bread from heaven for you, and the people shall go out and gather a certain rate every day, that I may prove them whether they will walk in my law or no. For it shall come to pass that on the sixth day they shall prepare that which they bring in, and it shall be twice as much as they gather daily." The manna fell, and some of the people gathered it as directed. Some of them kept of it until the next "morning, and it bred worms and stank, and Moses was wroth at their manifest want of confidence in God. On the sixth day "they gathered twice as much bread, two omers for one man; and all the rulers came and told Moses." Moses expressed his approval of what had been done, and commanded that, as they had gathered, so they should prepare on the sixth day what was required on the seventh, saying, "This is what the Lord hath said, To-morrow is the rest of the holy Sabbath unto the Lord;" assuming a known fact as a reason for the conduct of the people in gathering a double supply of manna on the sixth day, and also for the command, "Bake that which ye will bake to-day, and seethe that ye will seethe."

Throughout the whole of this narrative, it is plainly taken for granted that the people had some knowledge of the law by which they were to be proved, namely, the law of Sabbath rest. It was their own sense of duty that led the people, not only without any command, but in apparent opposition to a command, to collect on the sixth day a double portion of manna. They were already acquainted with the Sabbath law, and were expected to keep it, without any farther legislation regarding it. When some of the people went out on the seventh day and found no manna, the Lord was grieved at their disobedience, and "said unto Moses, How long refuse ye to keep my commandments and my laws? See, for that the Lord hath given you the Sabbath, therefore he giveth you on the sixth day the bread of two days." Why then do ye refuse to keep the Sabbath, when God has done this to enable you to do so! He has wrought this miracle to take away the necessity of your going out to gather food on the seventh day. The law which the people are here reprov'd for violating referred to the Sabbath; it was the

law by which they were to be proved; and since the law of Sinai had not yet been given, it can be no other than the law given in Paradise, when God "blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it."

At the beginning of the world God had revealed the principle of six days' labour, and one of rest; so again, by giving manna during six days, and sending none on the seventh, he confirms the principle originally made known to Adam, and establishes it as an unchangeable law by a series of miracles. On every sixth day he supplies a double portion of manna; and though what remained from one day to another during the previous days became putrid and unfit for food, yet the double supply of the sixth day remains during the seventh day fresh and good. The extra supply gathered on the sixth day supplied the necessities of the people during the seventh, the day of rest, on which no manna fell. The Sabbath therefore, it is obvious, was well known by the Jews as a divine institution before the giving of the law from Sinai.

"Nothing can be clearer than this, that the Sabbath, as maintained by the Jews, was antecedent to the Sinaic code, was understood by them, was acted upon by them, and calmly revolved without inquiry and surprise. Nothing can be simpler than the conclusion that they had never lost it, that it was their great binding compact, that it was the index of their calendar, that it was jealously reckoned and dreadly revered."

The law of the Sabbath itself, as propounded from Sinai (Exod. xx. 8—11), presupposes the previous existence of that institution. All the other precepts of the Decalogue begin with an express form of command; but this, the fourth precept, only calls to remembrance the Sabbath as already well known, for the future to be kept holy to the Lord. "Remember the Sabbath day to keep it holy." Moreover, in the reason given for the observance of the day—"wherefore the Lord blessed the sabbath day, and hallowed it"—there is plainly a reference to some previous account of the appointment of the Sabbath, and that account can nowhere else be found, except in the record of the first Sabbath in Paradise. The fourth commandment has a retrospective reference to the circumstances under which the Sabbath was instituted, and in effect affirms that when God rested from his work of creation on the seventh day, he then instituted the Sabbath. The reason given in the fourth commandment for the Sabbath day must have had an existence in fact, *i. e.*, God must have rested on the seventh day of creation

¹ Hamilton's *Horæ et Vindicæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 18.

from all his work which he had made, and at that time blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it.

These various considerations that have now been adduced, while they do not certainly prove that the Sabbath was observed during the early ages of the world, yet render it highly probable that this was the case. But there is satisfactory proof, not in one of the arguments taken by itself, but in the whole amount of evidence we have thus presented, that the Sabbath was instituted in Paradise, when God had finished the work of creation. Hence it follows,

“that the Sabbath is not of partial, but of universal, obligation. It was imposed long ere the Most High divided to the nations their inheritance, when he separated the sons of Adam. It is not a local or a temporary appointment. It precedes all forms and economies of religion. Subsequent dispensations may modify and expound it; but the ‘covenant which was confirmed before,’ no ‘law’ which was ages ‘after’ can ‘disannul.’ All the nations of the earth are interested in it. It is ‘given’ for all times, and for all places, in common, and alike to man.”^m

The ten commandments were given to Israel at Mount Sinai, in circumstances fitted to impress the minds of the assembled tribes with solemnity and awe. The sacred historian thus describes the scene: “And it came to pass on the third day in the morning, that there were thunders and lightnings, and a thick cloud upon the mount, and the voice of the trumpet exceeding loud; so that all the people that was in the camp trembled. And Moses brought forth the people out of the camp to meet with God, and they stood at the nether part of the mount. And Mount Sinai was altogether on a smoke, because the Lord descended upon it in fire: and the smoke thereof ascended as the smoke of a furnace, and the whole mount quaked greatly. And when the voice of the trumpet sounded long, and waxed louder and louder, Moses spake, and God answered him by a voice. And the Lord came down upon Mount Sinai, on the top of the mount: and the Lord called Moses up to the top of the

^m Hamilton's *Horæ et Vindicæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 19. We cannot refrain from here quoting in a note the eloquent words with which Hamilton closes his dissertation on the “original Sabbath.” “The first sabbath! What a scene unfolds! The sunrise of that dawn! the incense of the flowers! the chant of the birds! the splendour of the streams! the waving of the woodlands! the freshness of the dews! The voice of the Lord God is heard walking on the earth in familiar converse! The new-made man adores! . . . There he bends amidst the fair radiance of the first Sabbath! brightest of all that followed it; foremost of a series which never has been lost; sole relic of an innocence which is no more; and still the sacrament of benison and holiness which sin cannot despoil! The only garland rescued from Paradise faded, but still beautiful and redolent, with no thorn of the after curse and of the blighted world.”—pp. 23, 24.

mount; and Moses went up." So terrible was the sight, that Moses said, "I exceedingly fear and quake."

In these circumstances of dread solemnity Jehovah first uttered the ten commandments, and then wrote them on two tables of stone, and delivered them to Moses, to be preserved to future generations. In afterwards recapitulating to the Jews the dealings of Jehovah with them, Moses again refers to the circumstances in which the law was given: "These words (the ten commandments) the Lord spake unto all your assembly in the mount, out of the midst of the fire, of the cloud, and of the thick darkness, with a great voice; and he added no more, and he wrote them on two tables of stone, and delivered them unto me. And it came to pass, when ye heard the voice out of the midst of the darkness (for the mountain did burn with fire), that ye came near unto me, even all the heads of your tribes, and your elders; and ye said, Behold, the Lord our God hath shewed us his glory, and his greatness, and we have heard his voice out of the midst of the fire: we have seen this day that God doth talk with man, and he liveth. Now, therefore, why should we die? for this great fire will consume us: if we hear the voice of the Lord our God any more, then we shall die. For who is there of all flesh that hath heard the voice of the living God speaking out of the midst of the fire as we have, and lived? Go thou near, and hear all that the Lord our God shall say; and speak thou unto us all that the Lord our God shall speak unto thee; and we will hear it and do it. And the Lord heard the voice of your words when ye spake unto me; and the Lord said unto me, I have heard the voice of the words of this people which they have spoken unto thee: they have well said all that they have spoken. O that there were such an heart in them that they would fear me and keep all my commandments always, that it might be well with them, and with their children for ever" (Deut. v. 22—29).

The law of the ten commandments was remarkably distinguished in many important respects from all the other commandments that were given to the Jews. The Decalogue was uttered by the voice of God from Sinai, and its different precepts were written with his finger on tables of stone, which he had himself fashioned for that purpose; and when these two tables were broken by Moses, God commanded him to make other two like unto the first, and on these he wrote the ten precepts a second time, as if specially providing that they should in this wonderful manner be distinguished from all the other precepts given to his people. These two tables containing the Decalogue were also by divine direction deposited, not with the

rest of the Mosaic statutes, but in the ark of shittim wood overlaid with pure gold, called, from this circumstance, the "ark of the testimony,"—the ark containing the testimony. God declared unto his people "his covenant which he commanded them to perform, even ten commandments, and he wrote them upon two tables of stone." The laws of the two tables are thus invested with a peculiar eminence and an importance above that attached to all the other commandments given to the Jews. They are not on a level with the other parts of the Mosaic law, but hold a lofty and distinguished place, as precepts of primary and essential importance.

The permanent and universal obligation of the law, "written and engraven on stone," has, strange to say, been denied; and it has been asserted (by Archbishop Whately) that its authority is now abrogated. But it is enough, in reply to this assertion,—for it is simply an assertion, and nothing more,—to remark, that the law of Christ, as given in the New Testament, corresponds in all respects in its requirements with the law of the ten commandments. The express words of the Decalogue are not indeed reiterated by Christ; but the matter of the precepts he taught contains *substantially* the same enactments. In his Sermon on the Mount he explains and enforces the true meaning of the law as given by Moses,—a law which was to remain in all its unimpaired force under his own mediatorial reign in "the kingdom of God."

But there must have been a law of which sin was the transgression before that given by Moses—a law presenting a common rule of obligation to the whole human race—a law of which men universally were violators. The moral obligations of all men must ever have been the same, as the relation subsisting between men and God, and the obligations arising out of this relation, must ever have been the same.

The apostle identifies the law of nations with the moral law. He says (Rom. ii. 14), that the Gentiles who have not the (written) law do by nature the things contained in the law, and are a law unto themselves, thus shewing the work of the law written in their hearts. The dictates of the divine will in the teachings of natural conscience, when unperverted, are the same as the dictates of that will in the written law. The Gentiles were under the same moral law as the Jews, though they had it not in a written form. It was therefore the same law which was originally written on the heart of man, and which remained after the fall, though obscured and imperfect in natural reason, which was proclaimed to Israel in its complete and uncorrupted form from Sinai, and there written on two tables of stone.

The law of God, as the rule of moral duty, must of necessity ever be the same in its great principles and requirements. The ten commandments contain a summary of moral duty: they exhibit the principles of moral rectitude, and are therefore universally and permanently binding upon mankind. They are not binding because they were revealed to the Jews and written by the finger of God on two tables of stone; but they were re-promulgated to that people because they were unchangeably binding on the whole human family.

The summary of the divine law of moral duty contained in the ten commandments is the same in principle as that contained in these words of our Lord: "Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it, Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself. On these two commandments hang all the law and the prophets" (Matt. xxii. 37—40). The precepts of the first table—the first four commandments—reveal a comprehensive outline of our duty to God; and the precepts of the second table—the last six, an outline of our duty to man. The obligation of the ten commandments has no more ceased than that of love to God and to our neighbour.

In his sermon on the mount, our Lord says, "Think not that I am come to destroy the law or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfil. For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot, or one tittle, shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v. 17, 18). The meaning of this is, that there was no contradiction between what he had come to accomplish and the whole preceding revelation of God,—that no part of that revelation would be made void, or frustrated, by his coming and work. Not only so, but every part of the previous revelation was to be fulfilled or ratified; every declaration, of whatsoever nature, which God had made to man, should be proved by Christ's advent to be true.

Jesus came not only to fulfil the predictions of the prophets, but also to fulfil the law even in its minutest parts. By his coming every part of the ancient ceremonial law attained its object—was fulfilled. The meaning and end of every rite and ceremony was then explained, and its object accomplished. As it prefigured Christ, when he came it was fulfilled; its end was gained, and it was set aside. But it is apparent from the connexion of our Lord's words, that his reference is not to the ceremonial, but to the moral law. Verses 19 and 20 of the same chapter shew plainly that the law of which our Saviour speaks is one which is to remain in all its force in the "kingdom

of heaven ;” that is, in the New Testament Church, for the observance of it is the standard of honour in that kingdom. This is not the case with the ceremonial law, nor with those institutes that were peculiar to the Jewish dispensation ; for these we know were only of a temporary and figurative nature, and passed away with the dispensation to which they belonged. Christ came, then, not to destroy, but to ratify the moral law. He fulfilled the ceremonial law by accomplishing its typical predictions. That law was temporary, and when it had introduced the new dispensation, and served its purpose, it ceased to exist. But the moral law, being permanent in its obligation, as it arises out of the essential relations we sustain to God as his moral creatures, can never cease to be binding so long as man continues on earth. It was fulfilled by Christ in his perfectly obeying all its precepts. Every feeling of his heart and every action of his life was in perfect harmony with all its requirements. He “magnified the law and made it honourable.” He fulfilled it also by enduring the punishment which was due to man for its violation. His sufferings were an enduring of the curse due to us for sin.

Such a law, so obeyed, so vindicated, has no limited application to the Jewish nation. The curse from which Christ delivers by enduring the fearful sanction of the law, was that pronounced by Moses : “Cursed be he that confirmeth not all the words of this law to do them” (Deut. xxvii. 26 ; Gal. iii. 10). If the deliverance wrought by Christ is not restricted to the Jews, neither is the law from the curse of which he died to deliver mankind. The grace of the Gospel the apostle proves to be necessary, from the fact that men have broken the law (Rom. viii. 3, 4). This law could not be binding on the Jews only, for they alone are not interested in the Gospel. The Gospel offers its blessings to the whole human family, for all are alike under the curse of the law, which must therefore be of universal and permanent obligation.

But it has been said that the law of the Sabbath cannot be reckoned among the moral precepts—that it is a positive institute,ⁿ an institute or law not suggested by conscience, and having no authority or importance whatever, but as derived from the will of the lawgiver. Dr. Whately contends that those who maintain the permanent obligation of the fourth commandment,

ⁿ “A precept of a merely positive nature creates a duty which, but for the precept, would not exist, which does not depend for its existence on the nature of the relations sustained by the subject as a rational being, but is intended to promote some useful incidental purpose, and is not due nor demanded from the subject in other cases, although sustaining exactly the same relation. Thus the precept requiring the building of booths at the passover may be considered as a positive precept.”—Dwight, *serm.* 105.

in common with the other nine, thereby "acknowledge themselves 'debtors to keep the whole law,' ceremonial as well as moral, unless they are prepared to acquiesce in the utterly unintelligible dogma of the assembly of divines at Westminster, that the observance of the Sabbath is part of the moral law."

Even granting that the Sabbath were a positive enactment, the inference that it is therefore not permanent in its obligation is not legitimate. A positive enactment, unlike a moral precept, *may* be abrogated, but it does not follow that it *must* be abrogated. If it has been divinely instituted, it must remain binding till it is divinely repealed. We are morally bound to obey every positive enactment of divine authority, so long as it is unrepealed, just as much as if it were a precept of the moral law. The will of God is a sufficient ground for our obeying all his commands, and they continue morally binding on us till he himself abrogates them.

In the case of those institutions which are of a ceremonial nature, and which belonged to the Mosaic dispensation, we have the authority of him who appointed them for regarding them as but of partial and transient use, and as having ceased to be obligatory even on those to whom they were delivered. But we have already seen that the law of the Sabbath does not hold a place among those ceremonial enactments which were delivered to the Jews, but had its origin at creation; and therefore it does not necessarily pass away with the Jewish dispensation. There is nothing whatever in the Sabbath commandment either ritual or ceremonial.

"It is not a type of anything but itself. It is Archetype and Anti-type. With nothing can it exchange. Circumcision may pass into baptism. The Passover may be translated into the Lord's Supper. But the Sabbath is the Sabbath, and nothing but the Sabbath can it be. It owed a particular construction to Judaism; it owes a specific application to Christianity. But to no dispensation owes it existence or authority or right. It is from the beginning. It is the parent of dispensations. It is the root of religion. 'Its tabernacle is in the sun.'"^o

Not one of the ceremonial laws was incorporated in the Decalogue, nor written on tables of stone, nor deposited in the ark of the covenant. They were all delivered after the ten commandments in another form, and for other ends.

The very fact that the fourth commandment holds a place in the Decalogue, of which all the other precepts are undoubtedly moral, is of itself a presumptive proof that it is of the same nature. The same authority that renders any one of these pre-

^o Hamilton's *Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 90.

cepts binding renders all the others equally binding. "If men are bound in every age, and under all dispensations, to acknowledge one only God—to worship him not with graven images, but in spirit and in truth—to reverence the divine name—to obey their parents—to abstain from murder, adultery, theft, false witness, concupiscence,—they are equally bound to consecrate a Sabbath to their Maker's service, after six days of ordinary labour and toil."^p If the Sabbath law is not morally binding, how came it to be placed by the Divine Legislator himself in the very midst of a code of precepts, every one of which, except the fourth, is confessedly moral, and that, too, without anything whatever to indicate that it was of a character so diverse from all the rest.

"Nor is the PLACE which this fourth precept occupies in the decalogue to be overlooked. It is the last of the first table of the law, and prepares for the second. It is the keeper and guardian of the preceding commands, and the preparation for the following. It makes the first three precepts practicable. For after faith in one God, worship to him and reverence for his name, it prescribes the time in which this pure worship of the only true God is to be celebrated, the persons who are to unite in it, and the interruption to all ordinary labours, without which it cannot be performed. So that as the tenth commandment shuts up the second table, and reduces as it were its injunction to practice, by forbidding that concupiscence which would infallibly lead to their violation, so the fourth accomplishes the first table by assigning the time and season when its injunctions may be fulfilled."^q

It must be acknowledged that the worship of God is a duty of a moral nature. It is a duty arising out of the primary and essential relation we sustain to him as Creator. The end of the institution of the Sabbath being the worship of God, that institution must be of a moral nature. If it is a duty to worship and adore the Creator, it is also a duty, in order to the right performance of this worship, to appoint for it stated seasons ; if

^p Wilson's *Sermons on the Lord's Day*, serm. 2.

^q Wilson's *Sermons on the Lord's Day*, serm. 2. "The special cost (if we may so say) and care of God in delivering the commandment argues much worth and weight ; as 1. In the *length* and largeness of it, to make it plain and evident. 2. That whereas other commandments are propounded either *affirmatively* only or *negatively* only, this is both *affirmative* and *negative*. 3. It is charged upon all sorts of people particularly, especially superiors, to look well to the observation of it. 4. It is urged by many reasons : as first, God's *interest* in it, *it is the Sabbath of the Lord thy God* ; secondly, God's *example* ; he wrought six days and rested the seventh ; thirdly, his *sanctification* and blessing the Sabbath ; fourthly, the *equity* of the proportion, for *continuance* and *frequency*, but one whole day of seven for six allowed unto men ; lastly, it is stamped with a special *memento* in the very front of it, *Remember the Sabbath-day*, etc., lest it should be forgotten, and as a watchword of solemn preparation for it."—Cawdrey and Palmer's *Sabbatum Redivivum*, Epistle to Reader.

social worship is to be observed, and it seems from the universal practice of mankind to be either a law of nature or an ancient tradition to worship God socially, then a stated season for that purpose is absolutely necessary.

The duty which the Sabbath enjoins—the worship of God, is pre-eminently moral, binding upon all men. Every intelligent being is bound to contemplate and adore the perfections of God as they are displayed in his works and in his Word. It cannot be denied that this is a moral service, and hence that the precept requiring it is a moral precept. That this important duty may be rightly performed, as it is of a social nature, it is indispensable that a stated and regularly recurring season should be devoted to it. God has himself fixed the precise proportion of time which is to be devoted to Sabbath exercises. He so ordered the creation of the world as to fix the proportion of six days' labour and one of rest; but for aught we know he might have fixed some other proportion. He who knew our nature and our necessities, wisely fixed that a seventh part of our time was to be devoted to religious exercises. But while the proportion of time set apart for the special worship of God may be regarded as a positive enactment, the duty enjoined in the commandment is itself moral, and the positive nature of the proportion of time cannot effect the morality of the precept. God saw fit not to leave the proportion of time to be fixed according to the judgment or the caprice of man, but in order to the regular discharge of the duty, and as a check to that worldliness of mind which might lead men even to neglect the duty altogether, to set apart and consecrate one day in seven to be a day of holy rest, and to be devoted to the exercises of his worship. The Sabbath does not lose its moral nature because, along with the general principle of the worship of God and the cultivation of devout affections, duties which are admitted without hesitation to be of a moral nature, it fixes a certain proportion of time to be specially devoted to these duties.

It has been objected that if we receive as binding upon us the fourth commandment, we must observe as the Sabbath the particular day of the week that is therein specified—the seventh day, as alone sacred.

But in reply it must be noticed, that it is obviously in the very nature of things impossible that the command should bind us to keep holy the very hours which were originally consecrated as composing the Sabbath day. The necessary diversities in the natural divisions of time in the different parts of the earth render this physically impossible. The period of the beginning and the end of natural days varies in different countries accord-

ing to the latitude and longitude of the places." The Jews again reckoned their day from sunset to sunset; other nations reckon it from midnight to midnight. In the nature of things it is impossible that the Sabbath, as a day, can be observed at the very same time in all the parts of the world. The Sabbath-law, therefore, cannot require the same hours to be appropriated to Sabbath rest in all countries. The essential nature of the institution is not affected by a divinely-appointed change of the day. At the original institution of the Sabbath, it was set apart as a commemoration of the great work of creation—as a day designed to call the thoughts of men to the wisdom and goodness of the Creator, as displayed in the works of his hands, and to afford the opportunity of engaging in the duty of religious worship. The primary object of the institution was the adoration and worship of Jehovah as Creator, and it was fitting that the day selected should be that on which the work of creation was finished, and on which he himself rested from all his work, and thus consecrated by his example.

Afterwards, when this with the other precepts of the moral law were repromulgated from Sinai, the original reason for the observance of the day of Sabbath rest was still assigned; but in addition to the primary reason for its institution, other considerations were presented to the minds of the Jews as inducements to the steadfast and conscientious discharge of the duties enjoined,—they were reminded that the Lord, whose law was now enjoined upon them, had delivered them out of Egypt. The deliverance from the bondage of Egypt being thus added to the original reason for the institution of the Sabbath, shews that while the day in the great essentials of its character remains the same, unchanged and unaffected by the progress of time, events

" "When the English sailors first visited Pitcairn's Island, they arrived on Saturday, and found the islanders, with John Adams at their head, keeping the Christian Sabbath. They had gone to the island in different directions. The consequence was that the Saturday of the one was the Sabbath of the other, and the Sabbath of the one was the Monday of the other. And yet each company might continue to keep the Sabbath according to its own reckoning, if they were not to live together, and might do it with equal acceptance; though if they lived together it might be their duty to change; and either company might change its days of labour and of rest so as to conform to the other; and whichever party should change, they would continue as they had done before, to conform to the spirit and to the letter of the *Sabbath law*."—Permanent documents of "American and Foreign Sabbath Union," 1845, p. 7.

"This law"—by which the hours vary according to the latitude and longitude of places—"has varied the Lord's day from the first of the week unto the next among the Christians of the Pacific Ocean, because the ship which bore the first missionaries to those isles proceeded by the Cape of Good Hope,"—i. e., by an easterly course,— "and not by Cape Horn. Other mariners sailing by the latter were not a little surprised at the variation. The day which was then observed as we think most properly has been maintained."—Hamilton's *Horæ et Vindiciæ Sabbaticæ*, p. 43.

may yet arise in the government of God, which may furnish additional motives to the discharge of its sacred duties.

But an event of such vast moment may arise as to take precedence among all the works of God, as affording greater and more glorious displays of his character than were even made in creation itself. We should naturally expect that these displays would be celebrated not to the exclusion of the other, but in addition to them. Under the old economy, the two events which specially awakened the interest of the Jews, and which furnished motives and subjects for the right observance of the Sabbath, were creation and the deliverance from Egypt. But we have now to commemorate an event eclipsing all others in its glory—the redemption of a lost world by the Lord Jesus Christ. Creation was first in glory, and determined the day of the Sabbath's rest till the time of the redemption by Christ. It is meet that that redemption, while it is to be regarded as an additional motive to the observance of the Sabbath, and as supplying additional and exhaustless subjects for Sabbath exercises, should now determine the day of holy rest. Redemption does not destroy those reasons for the Sabbath that were already given—it is only an additional reason which in the order of importance holds the first place. The Sabbath celebrates the creation, the deliverance from Egypt, and the redemption by Christ; but among these, redemption takes the lead in the order of importance, and therefore it is fitting that it should change the day.

“Under the former economies, creation and the redemption from Egypt were the greatest benefits conferred upon man. Under the Christian, the spiritual redemption—the resurrection of Christ—the new creation of the world. The Sabbath, therefore, waited a day for the triumphs of its divine Lord, and then took the precedence, and led on the other days. In all these dispensations, the proportion of time dedicated to the immediate service of God, in which the substance of the command lay, remained the same.”^s

The change of the day, if by divine appointment, does not at all affect the nature of the duty of keeping the sabbath holy, as a moral obligation universally binding. But the fact of the divinely appointed change of the day will hereafter come more particularly under notice.

The fourth commandment begins by setting forth its object and design, and then prohibits the doing of certain things, the doing of which would hinder the accomplishment of that design. Labour is necessary to man, necessary to his very existence; yet labour is forbidden on the Sabbath, and may not be done,

^s Wilson's *Sermons on the Lord's Day*, serm. iv.

because it interferes with the holiness of the day. But while labour is forbidden, worldly pleasures and recreations are not allowed. The prohibition of that which is necessary to man, lest it destroy the sanctity of the day, would imply the prohibition of things that are unnecessary. While man is not to labour on that day, neither is he to devote its consecrated hours to ordinary pleasure and amusement.

The design of the Sabbath law was to secure the keeping holy to God one day in seven. The great principle of the Sabbath is not simply cessation from labour, but the spending of one whole day in seven in exercises of a religious nature. The law commands and enforces cessation from labour as subsidiary and necessary to a holy observance of it.

“What the Sabbath was at the period of its repromulgation from Sinai, what it had ever been from the creation, that it still is; the only means of perpetuating that profession of belief in the only true God and that worship of the Creator, which are an essential part of natural religion. As the Jewish Sabbath was a main preventive of idolatry, so is the Christian Sabbath a main barrier against atheism. The profanation of the Lord’s day has ever been, in fact, the essential mark of irreligion, and the first step in the career of crime. The man who disregards the institution refuses to join in the public acknowledgment of the Deity, and to kneel before the Lord his Maker. Whatever he may secretly believe, he makes an outward profession of atheism.”^t

The law of the Decalogue is the law of conscience, re-delivered from Sinai, and written by the finger of God on tables of stone in token of its perpetuity. The law of the Sabbath is a part of the Decalogue, and is destined to endure through all time as at once the monument of creation and redemption, and the only effectual safeguard against idolatry and ungodliness. It is a day necessary for man as man, in every region of the earth, and in all ages of the world. It is the grand means of practically uniting man with his Creator, and of elevating and purifying his affections while a sojourner in this world, and thus renewing in some degree the blessed communion which existed in Paradise between man and God ere sin had blighted our world.

During the continuance of the Jewish dispensation, we find frequent mention made of the Sabbatical institution. The law, as originally given, was never altered or modified, but, as occasion arose, it was explained or enforced. Its design and object were frequently brought under the notice of the people.

After the promulgation of the Decalogue from Sinai there were delivered to the Jews certain judicial statutes; but the

^t Conder’s *Law of the Sabbath*, p. 18.

Sabbath is specially noticed as of peculiar importance. It does not stand side by side with these statutes, but rises high above them, as having an importance and a value which they do not possess. The keeping of the Sabbath is associated with the great and all-important duty of worshipping God: "Six days thou shalt do thy work, and on the seventh day thou shalt rest and make no mention of the name of other Gods, neither let it be heard out of thy mouth" (Exod. xxxi. 15). And how remarkable are the words in which Moses refers to God's resting on the seventh day: "For in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and *was refreshed*" (verse 17). He intimates by this expression that God took a peculiar satisfaction in the Sabbath—viewed it with peculiar delight. No ritual or ceremonial ordinances are ever spoken of in this manner. On the contrary, God is said to take no pleasure in them (Isa. i. 13, 14).

At the close of all the communications made to Moses during the forty days he remained on the mount, the Sabbath is again mentioned as a day to be honoured and held sacred to the service of God: "Verily my Sabbaths ye shall keep: for it is a sign between me and you throughout your generations; that ye may know that I am the Lord that doth sanctify you. Ye shall keep the Sabbath therefore, for it is holy unto you. . . . Six days may work be done; but in the seventh is the Sabbath of rest, holy to the Lord. . . . Wherefore the children of Israel shall keep the Sabbath, to observe the Sabbath throughout their generations, for a perpetual covenant. It is a sign between me and the children of Israel for ever" (Exod. xxxi. 12—17).

It has been argued, from the fact that the Sabbath is here called "a sign between Jehovah and the children of Israel," that the observance of the day "was peculiar to that people, and designed to be so." In reply to this objection which has been advanced by Paley and his followers in modern times, as also by Archbishop Whately, after Heylin, Bramhall, and Barrow, it were enough to say that the whole Decalogue is also called (Deut. vi. 8) a sign, and if the same reasoning were followed, then the conclusion must be maintained that the moral law—the law setting forth duties confessedly of primary and unchangeable obligation is peculiar to the Jews.

The great purpose for which the Jews were separated from the other nations was to preserve among men the knowledge and worship of the living and true God as distinguished from all idol deities; amid the wide-spread and universal idolatry of the nations, to preserve one nation as the worshippers of the true God. If the Sabbath was given to the Jews as a distinctive

sign of their separation from the other nations, it must have been such a sign in its origin, nature, and design, that, by observing it, the Jews would declare themselves the worshippers of Jehovah, the only true God. Its observance would be the public profession of their faith in Jehovah the Creator of all. It was a sign, "because that in six days the Lord made heaven and earth, and on the seventh day he rested and was refreshed." The seventh day was set apart by God as a perpetual memorial of what he had done in creating the world. As such a memorial, the Jews who kept that day holy to the Lord thereby declared their belief that Jehovah alone was the Creator, and that he therefore was the only living and true God. The observance of the Sabbath being such a testimony, was in its very nature a distinctive sign of the Jews as worshippers of Jehovah. It was pre-eminently the badge of their religious profession. To observe it was to profess public faith in Jehovah as the only living and true God. To refuse to observe it was to renounce the worship of Jehovah, and to profess idolatry; and since the government of the Jews was a theocracy, such idolatry was virtually high treason. The Sabbath therefore is appropriately selected as a sign between God and the people of Israel.

Lest the Jews should on any pretext violate the law of the Sabbath rest, they are told that the alleged necessities even of seed-time and harvest must not be made an excuse for disregarding the ordinances of the divine appointment: "Six days thou shalt labour, but on the seventh day thou shalt rest: in earing-time, and in harvest, thou shalt rest" (Exod. xxxiv. 21). The prohibition, "Ye shall kindle no fire throughout your habitations upon the Sabbath-day" (Exod. xxxv. 3), must have extended only to the use of fire for *servile*, and hence unnecessary purposes; for on the Sabbath-day the fire was constantly maintained on the altars without violation of the law. As the conduct of our Lord himself, and his instructions to his disciples fully testify, the prohibition of all work on the Sabbath-day did not extend to works of necessity and mercy, but only to *servile works*.

When the Sabbath is viewed as a day holy to the Lord, punishments, the same as those denounced against idolaters and blasphemers, were threatened against the violators of it; for the Sabbath violator was regarded as guilty of disowning the God of Israel, and was put to death. There is only one recorded instance of the infliction of the punishment of death on the Sabbath-breaker. This occurred while the Jews were sojourning in the wilderness. The gathering of sticks on the Sabbath-day might seem a slight offence, but it was a public and presumptu-

ous violation of the divine law, and, in effect, a renunciation of allegiance to Jehovah, and therefore high treason against the king of Israel. As a warning to the people, the Lord said to Moses, regarding the man who had been found gathering sticks on the Sabbath-day, "The man shall surely be put to death: all the congregation shall stone him with stones without the camp" (Numb. xv. 30, 35)."

When, at the close of his life, Moses again enjoins upon the people the commandments he had formerly delivered to them, he does not repeat the fourth commandment, as he does the other nine, in the same terms in which it was promulgated from Sinai; but he amplifies it, and enforces it, by additional motives, as a command reserving and claiming the special attention of the people (Deut. v. 12—15); a circumstance this which can in no way be accounted for on the supposition that this commandment was merely a positive or ceremonial institute peculiar to the Jewish dispensation.

When we descend to a later period of the Jewish history, to the times of the prophets, we find frequent reference to the Sabbath in the efforts made by these holy men to arouse the degenerate people to a sense of their duty, and to a recognition of the claims of the sabbatic institute. Isaiah proclaims the blessedness of those who remember the Sabbath to keep it holy: "Blessed is the man that keepeth the Sabbath from polluting it." "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day; and call the Sabbath a delight, the holy of the Lord, honourable; and shalt honour him, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words: then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord; and I will cause thee to ride upon the high places of the earth, and feed thee with the heritage of Jacob thy father; for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it" (Isa. lvi. 2; lviii. 13, 14). The prophet also intimates that in the gospel times, when the ceremonial law, which prohibited eunuchs from coming into the congregation of the Lord, should be abolished, they would still be under obligation to keep the Sabbath holy; and the Gentiles

" "As to the objection that the punishment of Sabbath-breaking under the law was capital, the reply is sufficient that this is not peculiar to the fourth commandment—that it applies to various others; moreover that it forms no part of the law as recorded in the Decalogue, and therefore is not binding upon all men; and that the great use of the former penalty *now* is to shew how hateful is the violation of the Sabbath-law in the eye of the great Lawgiver; how certainly and severely he will punish the offence in the future world; and all the more that from the nature of the case, and the imperfection of human law, it may be impossible here to testify unchangeable hatred of the violation of his holy commandment."—Lorimer's *The Protestant or the Popish Sabbath*, p. 64.

also (Isa. lvi. 5, 6), the sons of the stranger should be bound by the same law, and should be joyful in the house of prayer for all nations."

Jeremiah denounces (xvii. 19—27) the threatenings of God against the Sabbath-breaker, and connects the favour of God and the prosperity of nations with the keeping of the Sabbath holy to the Lord. This language is utterly inconsistent with the supposition that it is merely ceremonial or temporary in its character, and plainly implies its spirituality and the permanence of its obligation.

Amos (chap. viii. 5) traces the oppression and injustice which at that time was practised among the Jews to the disregard of the Sabbath, and severely rebukes those to whom that day was a weariness. He declares an intimate connexion between Sabbath desecration and the existence of those social evils under which the land mourned.

Ezekiel represents (chap. xx), the sin of the Jews in polluting the Sabbath as peculiarly hateful in the sight of God, and as that which exposed them to his righteous displeasure.

Nehemiah, after the captivity, in the song or prayer of the Levites on the day when the children of Israel were all assembled with fasting and with sackcloth and earth upon them, when he enumerates the great blessings the Lord had conferred upon his ransomed people, makes especial mention of the Sabbath (ix. 14); "And madest known unto them thy holy Sabbath:" and the people entered into a curse and an oath that "if the people of the land brought ware or any victuals on the Sabbath day to sell, they would not buy it of them on the Sabbath." He also enforced the law which had anew been proclaimed to Israel, as a law obedience to which was necessary to their national prosperity (xiii. 15, 22).

After their restoration from their long captivity in Babylon, the people seem to have fallen into many mistakes regarding the spirit and design of their religious institutions. In proportion to their departure from the spirituality of the worship of God, was their strict obedience to its outward forms and ceremonies. Not content with the law as given to them, they added to it re-

* "This prediction" (Is. lvi. 6—8), says Holden, "is completely fulfilled in the Christian dispensation, under which it is declared in the prophecy that the Sabbath shall continue a divine institution; and that those who keep from polluting it, taking hold of the new covenant, shall be made joyful in the church, which is the house of prayer for all people. The house of God was never the house of prayer for all people till the Gentiles, under the Gospel dispensation, were admitted to all the privileges of grace: and under this dispensation the Sabbath was not only to continue, but a special blessing is annexed to the observance of it."

strictions of their own. The sin of national Sabbath-breaking was one of the reasons of their long captivity of seventy years (2 Chron. xxxvi. 21). The Jews now fell into the opposite error of rigid, formal strictness in their adherence to the Sabbath law. Accordingly, when our Lord appeared in Judea, the law of Moses being then in all its parts in full force, we find him both by word and deed reproving the Jews for their superstitious formality regarding the Sabbath, and restoring to its true place and its proper use that benevolent institution. They had lost sight of the spirit and design of almost all the commandments of God. This was pre-eminently the case in respect to the law of the Sabbath. They had altogether lost sight of its true spirit and original intention, and in proportion as they did so they became strict and superstitious, and scrupulous in its external observance.

The law of the Sabbath, as given to the Jews, has by many been regarded, but we believe without sufficient reason, as peculiarly stern and severe in its requirements. If we examine the sabbatic institute, not as interpreted by the Jewish Rabbis, or in the light of the superstitious practices of the Jews in the time of Christ, but in the conduct and teachings of Christ himself during his public ministry, we shall find no substantial difference between the manner in which the Jews were required to observe the Sabbath, and that in which we are required to observe it now.

Our Lord, while on earth, invariably honoured the Sabbath by his own personal observance of it, and spake of it as a day to be kept holy in the services of religion. So far from abrogating the law of the Sabbath, or relaxing its authority, he vindicated and established it. He did not re-appoint the Sabbath, because that was not necessary; nor did he enjoin that it should be kept with special strictness, this also was not needed; but the Jews needed to be instructed regarding its true nature and design. By their traditions they had corrupted it—they had reversed its whole order and design. Christ did not abrogate the Sabbath; he only freed it from its perversions, and from the traditions under which its true character was concealed.* The

* "In respect to the prohibition of work on the Sabbath, the rabbinical doctors divided works into principal and secondary. Each principal work had its long list of secondary ones under it, the doing of any one of which was a violation of the Sabbath. Thus to grind was a principal work. All dividing of things before united in their nature came under this head. The rubbing of the ears of corn was, of course, according to this tradition a violation of the Sabbath. . . . Among the particular things which might or might not be done were the following:—a man might not thresh—therefore he might not walk on the grass, which was a kind of threshing; a man might not hunt on the Sabbath—therefore he might not catch a flea while it

first recorded instance of our Lord's observance of the Sabbath is in the words of Luke (iv. 16, 22). When "he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up, *as his custom was*, he went into the synagogue on the Sabbath day." Again, we read that when he went to Capernaum, he taught the people on the Sabbath days. This is decisive of the fact that it was his regular habit to observe the Sabbath in the exercises of public worship. He justifies (Luke xiii. 10, 17; xiv. 1—6), the "loosing the ox or ass from the stall, and leading him away to watering," and the "pulling him out of a pit," into which he had accidentally fallen, as acts which involve no breach of the divine law, nay, as positive duties. If the law were strictly interpreted according to the *letter* of it, as the Scribes and Pharisees interpreted it, this is a description of work which was not permitted to be done; but as a work of mercy it was not inconsistent with the proper meaning and spirit of the divine statute. So on the same principle Christ vindicates his loosing the woman from her infirmity, and curing the man who was afflicted with dropsy, on the Sabbath day. Our Lord's miracles on the Sabbath day brought him into constant collision with the Scribes and Pharisees. The controversy between them was not whether the Sabbath was a divine institution, that was universally acknowledged, but concerning what constituted a violation of the Sabbath law. He never pleaded in vindication of his conduct, when accused of violating the Sabbath law, that he was about to set aside that institution and make all days alike, and that therefore he might do these things which he did; but, on the contrary, his invariable plea was, that according to its true nature and original intention, these things were not violations of its sanctity. If it had been his design to abrogate the Sabbath, he would not have failed to declare it.

In the case of the miraculous cure of the paralytic at the pool of Bethesda (John v.), our Lord departs from his usual mode of vindicating his working such miracles on the Sabbath day, and distinctly announces that he, as well as the Father, is

hops about, as that would be a kind of hunting. Again, he might not carry burdens on the Sabbath; accordingly he might fill a trough with water that his beasts might *come* and drink; he might not *carry* it to the place where they were. Of course the poor man that carried his bed after he was healed was a Sabbath-breaker. Equally unlawful was it, according to some of the Rabbis, to heal or minister to the sick on the Sabbath. A man with a diseased eye might plaster it on the Sabbath for the sake of ease and pleasure, but not for the purpose of healing. . . . Indeed to such lengths did they go in their scrupulous and superstitious observance of the day, that when Antiochus Epiphanes (1 Macc. ii. 34—38) oppressed Jerusalem (B.C. 168), a thousand Jews who had fled to the wilderness allowed themselves to be cut to pieces, solely because their enemy attacked them on the Sabbath."—*The Perpetuity of the Sabbath*, by Rev. A. A. Phelps, p. 110.

Lord of the Sabbath day. "My Father," says he, "worketh hitherto, and I work." That is, My Father hath hitherto continued to work on the Sabbath day, so I also work on that day. Though my Father rested on the seventh day from the work of creation, he is still working every day alike in conducting all the affairs of his providence, in preserving and governing the world, so I also work every day alike, in performing miracles and fulfilling the various duties of my mission. Our Lord here claims an equality with the Father, and in doing so he claims for himself the authority of the Father respecting the Sabbath day. Accordingly, on the next occasion on which we find him explaining the Sabbath law, he announces to the people that the "Son of man is Lord even of the Sabbath day." His disciples, in passing through certain corn-fields (Matt. xii. 1—8, etc.), and not having with them food to satisfy their hunger, and having no opportunity of procuring it, plucked some ears of corn to satisfy their present need. The Jews regarded this conduct on the part of the disciples not as in itself dishonest, for it was sanctioned by express statute (Deut. xxiii. 25), but as a direct violation of the law of the Sabbath—as work done on the Sabbath day. In vindicating the conduct of his disciples, and the principle he lays down regarding Sabbath work, our Lord refers to two facts recorded in Old Testament history. He refers to the conduct of David, who, in the extremity of need, took the shew bread, which it was lawful for none but the priests to eat, and ate of it, and gave also of it to those who were with him—the greatness of his need justifying a departure from the law. He then briefly announces the grand truth—"The Son of man is Lord also of the Sabbath day;" that is, he claims as Messiah, as Son of man, a Lordship over the Sabbath, just as David, in the case in question, claimed over the shew-bread. David was lord of the shew-bread when he used it in a case of necessity, yet without interfering in any way with the divine ordinance of the shew-bread. The act of his taking that consecrated bread, and giving it also to his companions, was not inconsistent with the positive religious rite of the shew-bread, for it was a case of necessity, and the ceremonial laws were not contrary to, or in any way designed to interfere with, the law of self-preservation. The law provided that the shew-bread should be eaten by the priests only, but the exigencies of hunger, the imperative demands of humanity, are a sufficient warrant for setting aside that law. What the disciples had done was a necessary satisfying of the cravings of hunger, and was not contrary to the true meaning of the Sabbath law. As Messiah, Jesus claims to be the Lord of the Sabbath, not that in this character he has a

right to dispense with it, or to alter it, but that he may on that day do those things which necessity and mercy dictate—things which are not contrary to the spirit and design of the Sabbath—not inconsistent with its devout observance.

He also refers in the same connexion to the conduct of the priests in performing on the Sabbath day in the temple all the work necessary in the preparation and offering of sacrifices. The temple service and the Sabbath are both of divine appointment. Why should the law of the Sabbath give place to the offering of sacrifices, which was a laborious service? Why was not the temple service so suspended or modified on the Sabbath day as to relieve the priests from the necessity of labouring? The offering of sacrifices was for the taking away of sins. The Sabbath has not this object in view. It cannot supersede the necessity of sacrifices. Obedience to the law of the Sabbath in resting from all labour could not stand in the room of sacrifices offered unto God. The Sabbath, therefore, must give place to the appointed ordinances of the temple worship. In other words, the offering of sacrifices on the Sabbath day, though attended with labour to the ministering priests, is not a violation of the Sabbath law.

“But,” says Christ, “I say unto you that in this place is one greater than the temple”—greater, as accomplishing more effectually than the sacrifices of the priests, the object of the temple services—viz., reconciliation to God. The sacrifices in the temple effected reconciliation with God only typically and symbolically. They could never of themselves take away sin. But Christ’s one sacrifice has accomplished what the daily, weekly, and yearly sacrifices of the temple never could do. He, by his efficacious sacrifice, superseded and rendered unnecessary the temple and its services. If the Sabbath must give place to the earthly temple, much more must it give place to him who is greater than the temple,—he is Lord of the Sabbath. The services of the Sabbath—the outward and literal observance of all the duties required by it, cannot be put in the place of his sacrifice as a ground of acceptance with God. Christ bids them look for reconciliation not to the Sabbath but to his one sacrifice. The self-righteous Pharisees, who regarded as meritorious the strict observance of the Sabbath law, would not go the length of placing the Sabbath in the room of the sacrifices of the temple; “Let them not, therefore, place the Sabbath in the room of him who was greater than the Sabbath, as he was greater than the sacrifices of the temple.”

Our Lord goes on to say—“But if ye had known what that meaneth, I will have mercy and not sacrifice, ye would not have

condemned the guiltless" (Matt. xi. 7). This is to be regarded as an answer to the question, What does God require of those who are restored to his favour? He requires not sacrifice but mercy—not outward observances but works of love and faith. What is moral and spiritual is of more estimation in God's sight than what merely appertains to the forms and institutions of religion. "To do justly, and love mercy, and walk humbly with God," is of more value in the sight of heaven than the most exact observance of all the external forms of religion. The minor parts of the service of God, must not, as they have an invariable tendency to do, usurp a place and an importance to which they are not entitled. The forms and positive institutions of religion must not take the place in our esteem of higher and holier duties. The Sabbath and its observances must not engage more attention than the cultivation of true and vital godliness. The Son of Man, as Lord of the Sabbath, thus places it in its right position, as a means to the attainment of an end, and not the end itself. As Son of Man, Jesus by his sacrifice settles the question of our acceptance with God without our obedience to any law; and as the Lord of the Sabbath he removed the institution from that place to which the Scribes and Pharisees had elevated it, and which it was never designed to occupy, and restored it to its original purpose in the benevolent arrangements of God. The Sabbath has nothing *in itself*, and in the *mere form* of its observances pleasing to God. In such a view of it, the Son of Man has wholly set it aside. He has already by his sacrifice placed us on a footing of reconciliation with God, and in any sense in which the Sabbath may be elevated to an equality with that sacrifice, or may be regarded as a substitute for the obedience, the affection, the homage of the heart, our Lord has set it aside.

"But do these explanations make void the law of the Sabbath? do they not rather establish it? Can it be imagined that our Lord would have thus spoken of this institution if it had been his intention to abolish or supersede it? The very pains he takes to place it on its right footing, may shew the light in which he regarded it, as a standing commandment of God, of perpetual obligation in the Church. In all his conversations on this subject—often as he had occasion to denounce the superstitious observance of the Sabbath, and to define the true doctrine respecting it—he never gives a single hint of its being a legal or ceremonial rite about to pass away. On the contrary, all the principles and rules which he lays down, assume not only its divine origin, but its continued obligation, and unequivocally imply, that whatever change might be made as to the day of its observance, in fulfilment of prophecy, and in honour of his resur-

rection, there was to be no change in the real and essential character of the ordinance.”^x

The Jewish interpretation of many of the institutions and precepts of God was wholly erroneous. By their traditions they perverted the law, and altogether misunderstood its real spirit and design; and hence the hostility with which they regarded our Lord’s conduct in not conforming to what they supposed was the law of the Sabbath-day. The Pharisees in all their opposition to Christ regarding the Sabbath, never once alleged that he designed or wished to abolish it; the whole controversy was regarding the manner in which it was to be kept. But why should he bring himself into such constant collision with the Scribes and Pharisees in his efforts to separate the institution from its perversions, unless it was to give it back to the people in its true nature and original design.

“Indeed, the work which the Saviour did for the Sabbath was precisely that which he did (Matt. v., etc.) for the marriage institution, with its conjugal and filial relations, and the laws of their observance, and for other laws of acknowledged authority and perpetuity under the gospel. *It was a work too which he never did for circumcision, or for any other institution or ordinance purely Jewish, and not designed to continue under the gospel dispensation.* When he rescued the marriage institution and the law of life from the perversions of Jewish tradition, did he mean to hand them down so rescued to us as of permanent existence and perpetual obligation—as part and parcel of the gospel itself? What less than this could he mean, when at the risk of life as a Sabbath-breaker he so rescued the Sabbath? Indeed, what was such a rescue of it but an emphatic injunction to observe it as rescued?”^y

It was obviously, therefore, no part of Christ’s design to abolish the Sabbath and make all days alike, but rather to perpetuate it, freed from its perversions, under the gospel dispensation. As explained and vindicated by our Lord, that sacred institution appears in all its original dignity and glory. “The Sabbath was made for man; and not man for the Sabbath.”

^x *The Son of Man Lord of the Sabbath.* A sermon by Dr. Candlish, p. 14.

^y *The Perpetuity of the Sabbath,* by Rev. A. A. Phelps, p. 115.

SOME STRICTURES UPON THAT PORTION OF
STANLEY'S SINAI AND PALESTINE,

Which treats of the latter country ; by a recent Traveller there.

FOUR editions of *Sinai and Palestine* within a period of eighteen months sufficiently demonstrate the popular opinion upon Mr. Stanley's work. So many beauties of the book have been pointed out, so much truth has been evidenced, so many excellent descriptions have been extracted, and so much praise has been awarded, that it is really a work of supererogation to go over ground made quite familiar by the laudation of others. Its readers have probably heard enough, and more than enough, of the multifarious and heterogeneous excellencies of *Sinai and Palestine*. They have not, however, been satiated with hostile criticism and adverse judgment. Perhaps, if only for novelty's sake, they may not be indisposed to listen to the other side of the question, and to weigh with impartiality some strictures which have been made on Mr. Stanley's labours. We are far from denying credit to the author's work,—and it is very probable that travelling with his book in our saddle-bag, and reading as we went, we have discovered much to be admired and praised where others have seen nothing to be remarked. If in its beauties, however, we have probably perceived what others have overlooked, we certainly have noticed what others have passed by in the defects of *Sinai and Palestine*. And these defects are by no means few or unimportant ; they are thickly scattered, and affect the tone of the whole work ; they are doubtful in principle and in practice, and in our opinion militate most strongly against the sterling value of the book that contains them. As such, we think it right to attempt to expose them even at this late hour of the day, not with a view of reversing public opinion upon the merit of the work, but of shewing how lightly and inconsiderately public opinion is formed, and how little dependence is to be placed on it, in anything but superficial details. As we are unable to express a judgment, from personal observation, upon any but that portion of Mr. Stanley's work which treats of Palestine, we have confined our attention exclusively to his labours on the Holy Land.

Amongst those statements, allusions, or inferences of minor importance in *Sinai and Palestine* which we consider inaccurate, or to which we are unable to add corroborative testimony, the following may be mentioned. Few travellers will be able to say from experience that in regions where “ for miles and miles there

is no appearance of present life," in the Holy Land there may be seen "the gathering of women at the wells" (p. 118). In no part of the Lebanon through which ordinary persons travel do they come upon ruined "towns and houses in amount and state of preservation which have no parallel except in the cities of Herculaneum and Pompeii" (p. 118). As a matter of fact, though opposed to Mr. Stanley's opinion, we opine that at both Rome and Egyptian Thebes "ancient buildings can be found in such profusion and magnitude as at Baalbec" (p. 118): witness the Colosseum and the Baths of Caracalla and Diocletian, the Pantheon and other gigantic edifices in the former; witness the Pylons and Propylons, the Hall of Columns and other portions of the colossal and extensive temples of Luxor and Carnac. We read that, in the time of the patriarch Abraham, besides Hebron "as yet no other fixed habitation of man was known in Central Palestine" (p. 164). We wonder how the geographical boundaries of Southern Palestine would run under the direction of the author? and whether or not the Pentapolis—at the least—existed prior to the time of Ephron the Hittite? Mr. Stanley does not think that the image suggested by the words of the Psalmist, "As the mountains are round about Jerusalem, so is the Lord round about his people," is "realized as most persons would wish or expect it to be." It is of course impossible to say how most persons who have not visited the Holy City would expect or wish these words to be realized: yet the fact is indisputable that hills in close proximity do stand about Jerusalem on every side, although they may not everywhere rise to a greater altitude, as it seems Mr. Stanley anticipated. It seems, however, altogether inadmissible to include the mountains of Moab in the imagery, standing as they do at so considerable a distance from the Holy City, and on the very side on which Olivet almost overhangs, and, as the author says, literally shuts in Jerusalem (p. 173); and this notwithstanding the authority of that historian who is elsewhere accused of "usual exaggeration"—Josephus. The situation of the city, we go on to read, "was not unlike, on a small scale, to that of Rome; saving the great difference that Rome was in a well-watered plain leading direct to the sea, whereas Jerusalem was on a bare table-land in the heart of the country" (p. 174). We leave the question of the similarity in position of the two cities to those who are acquainted with both; though it appears on the surface that, considering the "great difference" allowed by Mr. Stanley, the terms employed should rather be those of contrast than of similarity.

The way in which Mr. Stanley loves to illustrate things ancient by things modern, which is noticeable as a complete

mannerism in his style, not unfrequently leads him into awkward and untenable positions. Take but a single instance:—in page 184 it is stated that the Mount of Olives was the Jews' "open ground, for pleasure, for worship, for any purpose it might serve; the 'Park,' the 'Cericus,' the 'Campus Martius' of Jerusalem." A few pages further on (187) we find, in a foot-note appended to an account of the triumphant entry of our blessed Lord into Jerusalem, during which the procession passed through "the gardens," the author writing thus: "I have used the word gardens as the nearest approach which our language affords. Eastern gardens, it must be remembered, are not flower gardens, nor private gardens, but the orchards, vineyards, and fig-enclosures round the town." We must leave it to Mr. Stanley to explain how either the parks or the campus Martius, or indeed any "open ground," can be truly described by the words "orchards, vineyards, or fig-enclosures," situated, it must be remembered, upon the steep and the terraced sides of a high ridge "immediately overhanging the town." The modern village of Ajalon our author places on the north side of the valley which bears its name (p. 204): recent travellers are told by natives that its position is upon the south. A route which leads from the pass at the top of the same valley to the stronghold of Gibeon, and which takes fully two hours over several intervening ridges to traverse, Mr. Stanley describes as "another descent and ascent;" whilst he adds that, by making "once more a slight descent," the traveller "reaches that village," which in fact, commanding one of the main passes of Benjamin, lies strongly encamped upon the summit of an isolated hillock. The term "tropical" (p. 278), when applied to the vegetation and the jungle which line the banks of the river Jordan, seems somewhat rhetorical. We learn from *Sinai and Palestine* that one peculiarity of Samaritan towns consisted in their situation in deep vallies (p. 329). This surely is incorrect. To go no further out of the way than the road from one capital to the other of the two kingdoms, Bethel, and Geba, and Shiloh, and Lebonah, and Shechem (which is built at the summit of a high pass), and Sebaste itself, besides many other smaller or less important hill-top villages, speak strongly against such a description. This is one example of the rash manner in which Mr. Stanley so frequently ventures to generalize upon too slender and insufficient data, and in generalizing to contradict previous and subsequent assertions; for in p. 131, in a general description of Palestine, we read that "a city in a valley, instead of being as elsewhere the rule, is here the exception," whilst, in p. 329, the towns of one third of the country are placed "in deep valleys;" and of another third,

we are told, that the situation of cities on the tops of hills is as rare in Galilee as it is common in Judæa (p. 422). Another of the same class may be found in placing the cities of "Judæa upon hill-tops," forgetful of Hebron, which lies in and up the sides of an elevated basin; and Jericho, which stands in a depressed plain; and the Holy City itself—to mention no others—which is built on high table-land.

The Oxford professor appears ever anxious to impress upon his readers his opinion of the superiority of Western Christianity—that portion of it which we presume he would term Protestant—over that form of doctrine and practice which obtains in the East. This is not only remarkable in the work under notice, but likewise peeps out in the author's introductory professorial lectures delivered in the university. Perhaps Utah and the Mormon colony, that most consistent of all sects claiming and exercising the right of private judgment, and most protesting of all Protestants, was not present to his mind when Mr. Stanley wrote of our holy religion the words, "which has attained its full dimensions only in proportion as it has travelled further from its original source," or "as rising in the East, yet finding its highest development and fulfilment in the West" (pp. 155, 426). The question involved in these quotations is too large for discussion in this place. To these, together with the assertion that Christianity has no home on earth, "least of all in its own birthplace," we can only state our non-adhesion, believing them, as we do, to arise from an un-Catholic and sectarian spirit, and from a narrow and bigotted system which is unable to sympathize with anything in a sister church that accords not to its peculiar Shibboleth; a system and a spirit which predeterminately objects to everything in doctrine and discipline not fashioned to its own meagre form, and which ends in a depreciation of Christ's holy Church in the East, and in an antichristian admiration of the theory and practice of the followers of the false prophet of Mecca.

Our author is likewise desirous to impart the conviction which seems to have laid firm hold of him, for he alludes to it more than once, that "Christianity, even in its first origin, was nurtured in no romantic scenery" (p. 165), and "that as far as localities have any concern with religion, it is well to feel that . . . in the discourses in the walks to and from Bethany, and in earlier times the Psalms and prophecies of David and Isaiah, were not, as in Greece, the offspring of oracular cliffs and grottos, but the simple outpouring of souls which thought of nothing but God and man." Against this statement as a matter of opinion we have nothing to urge, though it appears somewhat

unguarded in a land of hills, and "abounding in caves," of which the physical features have so totally changed in the course of centuries, where woods cease to exist and rivulets cease to run; in a land which formerly flowed "with milk and honey," and which now has stamped upon it the character of "a fruitful land" made "barren for the wickedness of them that dwell therein," to venture to argue upon its style of scenery eighteen hundred years ago. Neither are we concerned to make this opinion accord with sentiments expressed elsewhere; and we leave it to the author to decide to which theory he will ultimately give his adhesion, to that which affirms that the discourses of our blessed Lord, and the inspirations of holy men of old, were "the simple outpouring of souls which thought of nothing but God and man," or to the other, which may be gleaned from a perusal of the following extracts. In treating of the "reality of the teaching of our blessed Lord," Mr. Stanley takes occasion to say:—

"If it is clear that the form of the teaching was suggested by the objects immediately present (to which subject a large portion of a chapter is devoted) . . . it is a proof that even that Revelation, which was most unlike all others in its freedom from outward circumstances, was yet circumscribed or—if we prefer so to state it—assisted by the objects within the actual range of the speaker's vision. . . . It is an argument which may be practically used to shew the simplicity and reality of a teaching which took its stand upon the ordinary sights and sounds still seen and heard in the same land where the teaching was delivered. And if it was thus suggested by outward existing images, it must also by those images be judged and explained."—p. 423.

Again:—

"The mere fact that our Lord's teaching was suggested by familiar and passing objects is not without interest and instruction. It shews that He was affected by the outward impressions of the moment, not only in the graven events of his life . . . but habitually and in his daily intercourse."—p. 424.

Again:—

"No other history (than that of Palestine) contains so many points of contact between the impressions of life and the impressions of outward scenery. But besides this imaginative result, if one may say so, the mountainous character of Palestine is intimately connected with its history—both religious and political."—p. 131.

Once more:—

"It is worth observing, that we are in a country of which the geography and the history each claim to be singular of its kind:—the history, by its own records unconscious, if one may say so, of the physical pecu-

liarity; the geography, by the discovery of modern science wholly without regard, perhaps even indifferent or hostile, to the claims of the history."—p. 111.

These extracts in juxta-position speak clearly enough for themselves, and it were useless to enlarge upon them.

Amongst the remaining statements we venture to think erroneous in the work before us, which are comparatively of little moment, these may be mentioned. Mr. Stanley speaks of the noble physiognomy of the Samaritan. This statement is not confirmed by those who have lately visited Nablous; amongst the younger Samaritans especially, the inevitable results of restricted intermarriage—and that within very narrow limits—is very apparent. He also appears to indulge in the popular error that this reduced sect are in some sort "a branch of the Jewish race" (p. 236). It is the fashion in some quarters—a fashion encouraged by the misapplication of Holy Scripture—to compare them, in their dealings with the Jews, to the meek and humble Methodist, in contrast to the overbearing and bigotted churchman. It is hardly necessary to state, that inspiration supplies no hint to this effect. The Samaritans were in no sort "a race of the Jews:" neither are they at all comparable to modern dissenters. They were a heathen people, which transplanted from their native land, and indifferently taught the creed of the Jews, had acquired a mongrel form of doctrine, and from a partial intermarriage with certain vagabond Jews, had acquired a hybrid descent. Moreover, both from direct statement and from inference, we learn that in our blessed Lord's time this sect was not considered a portion of the Jewish nation,—witness the epithet applied to the thankful Samaritan leper (St. Luke xvii. 18) of "stranger;" witness the commission of our blessed Lord to the twelve, "Go not into the way of the Gentiles, and into any city of the Samaritans enter ye not: but go rather to the lost sheep of the house of Israel" (St. Matthew x. 5, 6).—That Acre, as Mr. Stanley affirms, is the most northerly city of the holy land, is doubtful. Modern Jews place it without the boundaries of Palestine; hence many resort to that town in order to avoid keeping the double feasts and fasts rendered necessary by the sanctity of the Holy Land; such at least is the story at Jerusalem.—The author's account of the drying up and the running off of the Jordan (p. 298)—though we have not space to say why—is very unsatisfactory.—We cannot understand the sentence in his strictures upon the traditional site of St. Paul's conversion, which reads thus: "Such, according to the local belief, was St. Paul's view when the light became darkness, and he heard the voice which turned the fortunes of mankind" (p. 403).—Mr. Stanley's

explanation of the "dew of Hermon that descended on the mountains of Zion" (p. 396) is very farfetched, and his expression of "countless herds of cattle" grazing in the plains surrounding Lake Merom is somewhat exaggerated (p. 382), as much so as are the depreciating terms of "meanness and smallness" (p. 433) applied to the flourishing, increasing, well-to-do and stone-built village of Bethlehem (p. 433).

A trait, slight indeed, but very observable as indicative of the *animus* with which Mr. Stanley's book is written, may be discovered in the different manner in which authors of a different age or sentiment from himself are quoted. The works of modern writers, especially those of a particular school, are almost invariably and oftentimes very unnecessarily mentioned in an eulogistic strain; whilst the travels of ancient or mediæval pilgrims, and the works of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church, are quoted in a short, concise, and perfunctionary manner, just sufficient to indicate volume, chapter, or paragraph. For example, Napoleon's *Memoires* contain "instructive notes;" Ritter publishes "interesting lectures;" Dr. Olins' statements are "calm and clear;" facts are "well given" and "well stated" by Hegel; Dr. Richardson and Lieut. Lynch well describe what fell beneath their notice; Gibbon "solemnly closes his chapter on the Crusade," with words that, to us, do not at all bear that aspect; a certain "Essay" by Dr. Thompson is pronounced able, and a certain fact mentioned by Mr. Anderson is declared to be "well stated;" Lieut. Van de Velde's and the Dean of St. Paul's descriptions are both "excellent;" whilst Lord Lindsay "carefully describes;" "Lepsius is accurate," and so are Mr. Freemantle and others; Lord Arthur Hervey is "candid and learned;" the geographical powers of Dr. Robinson are rated "high," and the articles of Professor Royle are thought "able;" and whilst the infidel Miss Martineau is conceived to be, in the Canon of Canterbury's opinion, "one of the most graphic of Eastern travellers," an ungenerous and irreligious taunt upon Oriental Christianity by the superficial, shallow, and very flip-pant author of *Eothen* is a passport from the same authority to the character of "one of the most observant of Eastern travellers."

These uncalled for, though not always undeserved laudations of modern writers, appear the more objectionable when the reader is referred by the footnotes to the works of authors of, at the least, not inferior calibre. Quotations are made by Mr. Stanley without comment and without notice, from the labours of Josephus; of Eusebius, and Epiphanius; of Origen; of Sozomen, and Socrates; of Arculf, and Rauwulf; of Sæwulf, and

Sandys; of Joinville, Vinisau, and Van Egmont; of Maundrell, and Maunderville; of Benjamin of Tudela, and of Bernard the Wise. There are of course exceptions to this statement, but they are few and far between, and bear no proportion to the cases in which the rule holds good. Some facts are "well put" or "well described" by two writers as much opposed to each other as they are to Mr. Stanley, by Keith in his book on *Prophecy*, and by Mr. Williams, the author of *The Holy City*; but on the other hand, the latter is generally passed by as belonging in spirit, if not in age, to the "early travellers," and the peculiar theories of the former are not unjustly termed extravagant and untenable. Another writer, who forms an exception to the rule of quotation discoverable in *Sinai and Palestine*, is the venerated author of the *Christian Year*. Frequent extracts are made from this work. Sometimes the learning they exhibit is pointed out and patronized: sometimes the descriptions they contain are praised with the faint praise of which the poet sings. Passages are pronounced truthful "on the whole;" rhododendron in one place is a mistake for oleander; and the presence in another of the willow, though not historically certain, is permitted to pass muster. It seems, however, rather hypercritical to quarrel, in a poetic description of a region, where lichen abounds, with the expression "mossy stone;" and it certainly comes with ill grace from one who tells us that his individual imagination of the accidentals of the transfiguration is connected with a "peaked height," to cavil, in a poem, at the words "Tabor's lonely peak." We remember but two instances in which Mr. Stanley abandons the curt, laconic style of reference to early or mediæval travellers. Perhaps, it may be thought that his notice is less bearable than his neglect; for instance, he asserts that the sight of the goodly heritage of Joseph in the Holy Land "awakened a connexion of thought unusual for" Maundrell "and his age;" and he quietly disposes of Rauwulf with the statement that "the whole aspect of (a certain part of) the country is caught (by that writer) with intelligence remarkable for so early a traveller."

Mr. Stanley, as is well known, is extremely sceptical on the subject of the sacred sites and holy places of Palestine. Undoubtedly, there is a very great difference between one holy site and another. The authority of some stands upon a foundation which the sneers of no modern traveller, and the arguments of no modern writer can shake; whilst that of others rests upon no foundation at all. This is readily admitted by most unprejudiced persons. Yet some are either so wilfully perverse, or so hopelessly ignorant, as to confound in one indistinguishable mass all

the holy places, and to condemn them altogether as a series of monkish impositions. Such persons classify in a single division those sites of whose authority there is in reality no doubt, with those of whose authenticity there is in fact no claim. Take for example the holy places of Jerusalem. Christian antiquity from the most early period has ever remembered and held dear the sacred place in which the Holy Body of the Saviour of the world was laid. But will any one, uninfluenced by the most bigotted and antichristian prejudice, presume to say that the authority of this site rests on a par with the evidence on which the "stone of unction" or any other of the minor sites depends? The truth is that a wide gulf exists between the great sites and the less; a gulf which not only palmers and pilgrims observe, but which the authorities at Jerusalem and elsewhere do recognize. What we by figure of speech call the lesser sites are not in fact sites at all, and what is more important, it is not pretended that they are sites. It has been explained before now, amongst other English works on the subject, in that valuable work, *The Holy City*, that these "sites" are determined arbitrarily and are selected, not with a view to point out any actual spot, still less, as interested Protestants love to say, with a wish to mislead the uneducated; but solely with the object of individualizing certain facts, with the intention of bringing more vividly before the imagination certain truths, and hence of inciting and of increasing the devotion of the faithful. Travellers of the modern cast, credulous in their very abhorrence of credulity, refuse to acknowledge this, and are loud in their denunciations of priestcraft. They seize upon a palpably unlikely "site," upon one that is purely conventional, and expose its falsehood and its imposition. But they go further, and fancy they exercise a most discerning and philosophical function of logic, in arguing from a less to a greater, and so presume to reject the authenticity of "sites" that are not conventional but positive, not arbitrary but actual. For our part we cannot conceive anything more absurd than to attempt to mingle in confusion the various holy places, and to deny to some what is not premised of others. Even if we allowed, which we do not, that many spots were selected at random with an intention to deceive; it would by no means follow that suspicion would be thrown on the rest. The different classes of sites owe their origin to such different causes, their recognition to such different events, their authority to such different demonstrations, and their sanctity to such different degrees of veneration, that it is wicked and absurd to attempt to confound them. In age and date, in history and tradition, in Catholic acceptance and partisan preference, in

essentials and accidentals do they differ, and that most widely. It was left for our enlightened age to make obscure what was before plain, and to intermingle what was before distinct. It was left for our race and language to throw doubt over what was before doubtless, and to make common what was before holy. It was left for English priests and American ministers to teach Catholic consent its errors in matters of fact; and in matters conventional to brand as errors what it did not teach.

It is conceivable that persons should so far blind their moral and intellectual vision as not to be able to observe what others clearly see. Not only in religion are we taught, what in morals is evident, that light refused is light quenched; but it is highly probable that a similar law holds good in the case of the intellect. And what may be theoretically held as a matter of opinion, is well nigh confirmed in the experience gained by a perusal of the question of the holy places. It is conceivable then that persons may reject the authenticity of the sacred sites. In general, the mass of Protestant pilgrims, English and American, concur in a want of faith. In these persons few are remarkable one way or another, in their want of belief, or in their want of credulity: and the chief thing noticeable in their productions is the extremely commonplace cast of their ideas, opinions, and reflections. But those who are considered their leaders reserved for themselves the prerogative of presumption; and it was left for them to indulge in the recklessness of folly which certainly lifted them above the vulgar crowd—to be the wonder and amazement of all thoughtful and disciplined minds. Some consideration is certainly due to those who after patient research and calm consideration are unable to master the historical difficulties which beset the acceptance of the great sacred site in Palestine. Some pity is to be shewn to those who really are unable to realize the force of authority, Catholic consent, universal tradition, and high probability in favour of the authenticity of the Holy Sepulchre. But what are we to say to the man who, against every probability, against all tradition, in opposition to all consent and to every authority, pretends to discover the real cave after a lapse of eighteen hundred years? This extraordinary union of self-deceit and deception, of credulity and the desire to impose, of blindness and the wish to give light, of presumption and incompetency, it would have been dangerous to predicate of any educated and learned man; but such an one was to be found a pilgrim at Jerusalem at the commencement of the present century. The case before us is doubtless one to be condemned strongly; yet what is to be said of Mr. Stanley, who refusing to accept the acknowledged tradi-

tional sites, ventures to discover fresh ones for himself, not, we may add, of the site of sites, but of the inferior localities? who not only without authority, but against authority selects holy places? not only without reason but against it? not only without certainty but against probability? Surely such an author deserves severe critical castigation.

Let us then examine with due brevity some of the new sites to which we are required to give our adhesion. And in this survey we shall discover much dogmatism and arrogance in the manner of stating the author's theories, and not a little want of charity in dealing with the theories of others. First there is "every probability" that Gerizim is the site of the meeting of Abraham and Melchizedek, and the sacrifice of Isaac (p. 246), in opposition to the received opinion. Samaritan tradition appears to have great weight with Mr. Stanley. With respect to the first incident we do not consider it probable that Melchizedek would have travelled south-east from Salem to meet Abraham returning from his pursuit in an almost similar direction. With respect to the other, the distance from the "extreme south" of Palestine to the Mount Gerizim, would preclude, in our opinion, the possibility of an aged man and a young child reaching the spot in the time mentioned. Little need be said of the value of the expression on which Mr. Stanley lays so much stress, that Abraham "lifted up" his eyes towards the place; and from which he gleans that the hills of Jerusalem are not lofty enough to warrant such a term. Does the author remember that from the top of a camel's back Rebekah "lifted up" her eyes and saw her future husband meditating in the field? or that Lot "lifted up" his eyes, and beheld all the plains of Jordan lying beneath him, at the depth probably of three or four thousand feet? Next, there can be "no doubt" (p. 187) that a path pointed out by Mr. Stanley is "the road of the entry of Christ" at his triumphant ride to Jerusalem: this must be the case, since "it is and always must have been the usual approach "to the Holy City." Not content with a general description of the road, he descends to particulars, and in the same positive manner the author says that at "this precise spot" the shout of triumph burst forth, and at that "exact spot" our blessed Lord did weep. Of course these "precise coincidences" of the features of the route are the more remarkable, as the "traditional spot" is necessarily "wholly inapplicable" to the author's theories. Again, Pisgar is in "all probability" the real quarantania (p. 315), for the "Pisgar view must have been his" (p. 425), and because to the "same wilderness" near where St. John baptized, "probably that on the eastern side, Jesus is de-

scribed as 'led up' (p. 306). So also with respect to the hill of the transfiguration people are strongly and blindly mistaken, for "it is impossible to look up (with the author) from the plain to the towering heights of Hermon, and not be struck with its appropriateness to the scene" (p. 392).

"Of course," says the writer, "historical scenes and sanctuaries will sometimes coincide" (p. 431); but if we had not a single example of this reluctant truth, we should be inclined to suppose the word "accidentally" had been omitted. Let us give traditional testimony the benefit of Mr. Stanley's candour. The mount of the beatitudes is the fortunate *protegé*. The situation of this hill, we read, "so strikingly coincides with the intimation of the Gospel narrative, as almost to force the inference that in this instance the eye of those who selected the spot was for once rightly guided." However bearable Mr. Stanley may be in his contradictions and perverseness, he is utterly intolerable in his patronage. And we may add, that if there was a spot which, above all others, independent of tradition, was of doubtful authenticity, that spot is the Horns of Hattin. There are half-a-dozen heights in the neighbourhood which would all equally fulfil "the intimations of the Gospel narrative." Even in this case Mr. Stanley cannot forbear from asserting that in the middle ages this spot was "selected," and that it was "in all probability first suggested to the crusaders by its remarkable situation" (p. 360). This species of charity largely infects the pages of *Sinai and Palestine*, and its development is largely intermingled with a peculiarity—shall we call it instinct?—for discerning motives for the actions of others. For example, the site of the preaching of St. John the Baptist was "influenced doubtless in part by the convenience of a spot near Jerusalem" (p. 304). Again, the traditional "spot of the feeding the five thousand," and the "scene of the demoniacs" (p. 378), were "probably selected for the convenience of pilgrims." The site of the sacrifice of Isaac was selected with the "intention of connecting" it with the crucifixion (p. 247). The same sentiments peep out elsewhere. Even a supposititious want of traditional sites is sufficient to excite inuendos against what cannot be directly assailed; *e.g.*, the convent on Mount Carmel, innocent as it is said to be of holy places, is treated as if it had been a very hot-bed for the production of sites. Not content with affirming that "the bluff promontory does not represent the scene of Elijah's sacrifice," it is added that it "does not even pretend to represent it:" not satisfied with asserting that the convent derives no interest from any connection with the prophet, it is added, "no interest real or pretended." Nor can the subject be quitted

without another sly hit at the good monks, for on the supposition of some connexion between the convent and tradition, the suggestion is hazarded that the building "would have been founded near the scene, or have fixed the scene nearer itself" (p. 344). Really one who shews so little Christian charity to others should not be surprised at the like measure being meted to himself. He should not be annoyed if persons attribute his blind following of a modern American divine, at issue with the Church on many points of doctrine and discipline, as some will attribute it, to an unhealthy longing after something new, to an impatient shrinking under the shackles of antiquity, and to a morbid desire to acquire notoriety by the singular advocacy of opinions which pander to the taste of the thoughtless and irreligious many, but which deeply grieve and wound the feelings of the reverend and considerate few.

We have now to deal with a far more serious matter than mistakes or errors of minor importance, misplaced towns, slight exaggerations, injudicious generalizations, or incongruous statements; and have to approach a subject—with much regret and hesitation—before which other shortcomings fade in comparison. We allude to the method and manner with which Mr. Stanley deals with Holy Scripture, writes of sacred events, alludes to holy persons, and treats of holy things. We do not undertake to notice all the instances we remark in *Sinai and Palestine*; some have been animadverted upon by other journals and some do not appear suitable to be discussed in this. Nor do we propose to notice these failings at length; it will be enough to point out what is objectionable in some cases, in others briefly to remark upon them.

In discussing "the views of Sacred History," Mr. Stanley observes that "one striking consequence of the elevation of the whole country is that every high point in it commands a prospect of greater extent than is common in ordinary mountain districts." He then proceeds to describe the views enjoyed by Abraham and Lot, by Balaam and Moses. Next comes the view "in vision" of the prophet Ezekiel, and, it is added, "Such, in vision also, was the mountain 'exceeding high,' which revealed, on the day of temptation, 'all the kingdoms of the world and the glory of them.'" And to prevent any one from mistaking his meaning, the author goes on to contrast this last "vision" with the view of the holy city, obtained by our blessed Lord during his triumphant entry, "Such, not in vision, but in the most certain reality," etc. Now the prophet says expressly (xl. 2), "In the visions of God," etc. But does the Holy Spirit, speaking by St. Matthew, give the slightest hint or intimation that the

"view" recorded in his fourth chapter, as opposed to "the most certain reality," was a mere "vision." This, the first instance of what we complain, is serious enough; the second and subsequent ones we adduce are still more serious. In a paraphrase of the recorded capture of Ai, with the aid of geographical illustration, so important and so useful when applied with judgment, Mr. Stanley takes occasion to say that "in the second attempt (after the repulse of the three thousand men), after the Israelites had been re-assured by the execution of Achan the attack was conducted on different principles" (p. 198). We cannot refrain from observing the thoroughly low and humanitarian description of this typical history. According to the text it is a mere sentiment or feeling revived, or material courage rekindled, or re-action of animal spirits cast down by failure, or a change of military tactics, which caused the ultimate success. According to the testimony of him who seeth not as man seeth, the cause was something far different. Almighty God says (Josh. vii. 11, 12) "Israel hath sinned therefore the children of Israel could not stand before their enemies;" and (vii. 13), "There is an accursed thing in the midst of thee, O Israel; thou canst not stand before thy enemies until ye take away the accursed thing from among you." Here we are told by infallible Truth that the cause of defeat was the presence of evil; and by inference we learn, by the promise of victory, that the cause of success was absence of wickedness: which things—it may be added—are an allegory! There is an extraordinary passage in page 202. The "magnificent description of the advance of Sennacherib upon Jerusalem" is the subject matter: the inspired reference, the tenth chapter of the book of the prophet Isaiah. The passage reads as follows: "Whether he (Sennacherib) actually entered Judæa by this road, or, as might perhaps be inferred from the mention of Lachish as the point from which he eventually came up, by Esdraelon and the maritime plain, the selection of this route by the prophet shews that this was the ordinary approach." The words following the assertion, that by the prophet "every step of the (conqueror's) approach is represented, in order to give greater force to the sudden check which is in store for him," fill us with amazement. They amount, in fact, to a questioning either of the prophet's prevision or of his historical fidelity. They assert that for rhetorical ornament, truth had been, or might have been tampered with; that whilst "every step of the approach is represented," it is possible that by another route Sennacherib "actually entered Judæa."

All readers of *Sinai and Palestine* must have read with in-

terest its writer's account of the celebrated victory and miracle of Joshua over the confederate kings of Palestine. It is in his best style, and contains, alas, some of his most grievous statements. However, the mere accidental part is very well done. The various points are well brought out, and the whole case is well laid before the reader. The danger of Gibeon is insisted upon; the strength of the alliance is alluded to; the promptitude of action and the decision of the general is enforced; the forced march from Gilgal and the "awe and panic" of the enemy is described; their route in its many stages is traced, and their "flight down the descent of Bethoron" is told in a very spirited and animated manner. All this is very good, and had we no guide but Mr. Stanley, nothing could be more satisfactory; we should be disposed to place him among the first of descriptive historians. But when we remember that he obtains his account from a source common to all, and when we call to mind that this common source is moreover in the highest sense trustworthy and true, we are beyond measure astonished at the author's boldness and presumption, at his recklessness and hardihood, when we read that at this point in the narrative, "as afterwards in the fight of Barak against Sisera, one of the fearful tempests which from time to time sweep over the hills of Palestine, burst upon the disordered army" (p. 206). God's Holy Word says that "The Lord cast down great stones from heaven upon them unto Azekah: and that (though that was a great slaughter), they were more which died of hailstones than they whom the children of Israel slew with the sword" (Josh. x. 11). Two questions suggest themselves, Do the words of inspiration convey the idea of any ordinary tempests which come in Syria from "time to time," or any common hail-storm? Do ordinary Syrian hail-storms generally prove so destructive as the one in question? Better, better far, once for all, shut fast and close the Book of Life; better leave alone all imaginary, all real connexion between sacred geography and sacred history, than misquote and garble in so fearful a fashion the express, clear, and decided statements of Holy Scripture. After this, notwithstanding we learn from very Truth that "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," we shall cease to wonder at the manner in which Mr. Stanley apparently lowers its claims (p. 243). In dogmatic statements of such a nature, delivered on the works of ancient authors, whether sacred or profane, we are always at a loss to conceive how or where the critic obtains his authority for branding certain statements as false, and for condescending to accept certain others as true. It must arise from natural and innate instinct not to be acquired

by the vulgar many, by which the refined few do raise from the profound depths of their inmost consciousness the touchstone of fact and fiction. Hence, of course, arises the want of reverence for Holy Scripture so common in our day, and the familiar and patronizing manner in which it is spoken of, or its subjects alluded to. Instance the "prosaic accomplishment of the prophetic Scriptures" (p. 267). Instance the off-hand description of a prophet of the Most High God, the prophet Elijah, as "the most romantic character Israel ever produced" (p. 321). Instance the worse than off-hand description of the teaching of a greater than a prophet as "matter of fact" (p. 425). Instance the unphilosophical and illogical, as well as untrue use of the terms "confirmation" (p. 279), and "testimony to the truth of" (p. 359), applied so frequently and so lightly to the unerring records of unerring wisdom. Instance again the *animus* which dictated the following lines, extracted from page 412, and say which portion of his inner self preponderates—the cold, calculating critic, or the reverential and devotional divine:—"It has been thought worth while briefly to bring together the general framework of the Gospel history, partly as a means of testing its general truth, partly as a help, though slight, to find our way through the confusion of time and place in which three, at least, of the narratives are involved."

Nor are these the only instances of what we condemn. Another one occurs in the chapter entitled "Peræa and the trans-Jordanic provinces." The Israelites, we are told (p. 318), were now in the territory east of the River Jordan. They were not permitted to remain there. "Forward they went. It was the same high calling which had already called Abraham from Mesopotamia, and Moses from the Court of Memphis, whether we name it impulse, destiny, or Providence." With this description of writing reverent minds will be greatly shocked. It is a very poor attempt at what our trans-Atlantic cousins would call smart writing; but the honest straightforward English mind rebels against what in plain vernacular it stigmatizes as profane. Does Mr. Stanley mean to teach the nineteenth century that "impulse, destiny, or providence" are synonymous? to confound the three? and to insult the one at the expense of elevating another? and dogmatizing on the third by characterizing all three as "high callings?" Whether or not, we consider such a sop, thrown out to appease the rationalistic portion of his readers, unworthy of Mr. Stanley's position in the world of letters, and totally opposed to his office in the Church of God. It is a miserable attempt at compromise to unite things opposite, and to assimilate contrary modes of faith, which cannot be too

plainly exposed, or too severely condemned. The same spirit manifests itself in the account of what, as opposed to the traditional, may be, without offence, termed the Stanleyan site of the spot where our blessed Lord, in his triumphant entry into Jerusalem, wept over the Holy City. This site the discoverer declares, "undefiled and unhallowed by mosque or church, chapel or tower, is left to speak for itself." To which fate this sentence also, is better left.

This portion of our subject may be fittingly closed with a solemn protest upon our part against the almost exclusive manner in which Mr. Stanley writes of, illustrates, examines, descants upon, and contemplates, the human nature of our blessed Lord. Such a peculiarity observable in a person whose writings have caused so much distrust as those of Mr. Stanley, is the ground for grave and serious apprehension. It is necessarily too large a matter to be dealt with in any other than a summary way in this place: and it is likewise one in which it may be difficult, in a work of the character of *Sinai and Palestine*, to balance with impartial hand the allusions to the two natures of the Son of God. Hence it were unwise to do more than warn the reader of the side to which the scale gravitates, and to make a few extracts to shew that the warning is not unneeded. Some of the passages already discussed will exemplify sufficiently well the danger to which we allude. That part of his work in which the author treats of "the Gospel History and Teaching viewed in connexion with the localities of Palestine," will supply more. The first, in itself innocent enough, becomes suspicious from the pen of Mr. Stanley. Our blessed Lord accompanies his parents to the passover (p. 409), "then, for the first time, he saw the interior of Palestine," and "the one or two days' journey from Nazareth to Bethabara, must have introduced him, for the first time, to the wild scenery of the Jordan valley and of its eastern desert." The second is by no means innocuous, come from what writer it may. We read, "Three occasions occur when Christ was compelled to retire into the less frequented parts of Palestine. . . . The first of these was when John was beheaded, when many of the disciples turned from him, when the first approach of his end dawned upon him and upon them" (p. 411). "When the first approach of his end dawned upon him!" Is it possible that such a fearful sentence could be conceived, composed, put upon record, printed, revised, and published to the world as the production of a priest in the Catholic Church? What low ideas of the divinity of Christ does it not betray! What a debased and carnal creed does it not evince! What awful thoughts of the very and eternal God—of him who

was of one substance with the Father, of the very God of very God, does it not suggest! It is truly grievous to read and repeat such terribly humanitarian ideas.

We have before made some extracts from the author's considerations upon the "reality of the teaching" of our blessed Lord. He remarks, "It is an argument such as in the days of subtle theological speculation might have been justly and forcibly used for what is termed the perfect humanity of Christ." We may add, that in days when theological speculation is superficial and shallow rather than subtle, it may be, and alas has been, used without justice, and without force, to prove the perfect humanity of our blessed Lord to a point which involves the denial of his perfect divinity. Next the author treats of the "homeliness and universality" of the same teaching, and the same features again present themselves. In attempting to find a reason why the figures which adorn the Saviour's language are, in opposition to the custom of the holy men of old, generally drawn from the "humbler and plainer" ones "of everyday life and observation," Mr. Stanley says, "It were vain to ask the precise cause of these omissions and selections." Well were it did the author stop here, and, as his better nature prompts him, not seek to be wise, or to seek to make others wise, above that which is written. But no! He must go on and venture to add,

"Perhaps there may be found some answer in the analogies, partial as they are, of the absorption of the greatest of ancient philosophers and the noblest of mediæval saints; which made Socrates delight in the city rather than in the country; which made St. Bernard, on the shores of Geneva, unconscious of the magnificence of the lake and mountain around him."—p. 425.

A fit reply truly: an argument from the creature up to the Creator; a discovery of the springs of action, "partial as they are," of the infinite from the observation of those of the finite; an elucidation of the ways of omniscient wisdom by the scanty knowledge of human intellect.

The next subject for discussion is Mr. Stanley's theory of Syrian sepulchres, which (with a slight exception to be noticed hereafter) we give entire.

"Next to the wells of Syria, the most authentic memorials of past times are the sepulchres, and partly for the same reason. The tombs of ancient Greece or Rome lined the public roads with funeral pillars or towers. Grassy graves and marble monuments fill the churchyards and churches of Christian Europe. But the sepulchres of Palestine were, like the habitations of its earliest inhabitants, hewn out of the living

limestone rock itself. In this respect they resembled, though on a smaller scale, the tombs of Upper Egypt; and as there the traveller of the nineteenth century is confronted with the names and records of men who lived thousands of years ago, so also, in the excavations of the valleys which surround or approach Shiloh, Shechem, Bethel, and Jerusalem, he knows that he sees what were the last resting-places of the generations contemporary with Joshua, Samuel, and David. And the example of Egypt shews that the identification of these sepulchres even with their individual occupants is not so improbable as might be otherwise supposed. If the graves of Rameses and Osirei can still be ascertained, there is nothing improbable in the thought that the tombs of the patriarchs may have survived the lapse of twenty or thirty centuries. The rocky cave on Mount Hor must be at least the spot believed by Josephus to mark the grave of Aaron. The tomb of Joseph must be near one of the two monuments pointed out as such in the opening of the vale of Shechem. The sepulchre which is called the tomb of Rachel exactly agrees with the spot described as 'a little way' from Bethlehem. The tomb of David, which was known with certainty at the time of the Christian era, may perhaps still be found under the mosque which bears his name on the modern Zion. Above all, the cave of Macpelah is concealed, beyond all reasonable doubt, by the mosque at Hebron. But, with these exceptions, we must rest satisfied rather with the general than the particular interest of the tombs of Palestine. The proof of identity in each special instance depends almost entirely on the locality. Instead of the acres of inscriptions which cover the tombs of Egypt, not a single letter has been found in any ancient sepulchre of Palestine; and tradition is, in this class of monuments, found to be unusually fallacious. Although some of those which are described as genuine by Jewish authorities can neither be rejected nor received with positive assurance, such as the alleged sepulchres of Deborah, Barak, Abinoam, Jael, and Heber, at Kadesh; and of Phineas, Eleazar and Joshua, in the eastern ranges of Shechem; yet the passion of the Mussulman conquerors of Syria for erecting mosques over the tombs of celebrated saints (and such to them are all the heroes of the Old Testament) has created so many fictitious sepulchres, as to throw doubt on all. Such are the tombs of Seth and Noah in the vale of Lebanon; of Moses, on the west of the Jordan, in direct contradiction to the Mosaic narrative; of Samuel, on the top of Nebi-Samuel; of Sidon and Zebulon, near Zidon and Tyre; of Hoshea, in Gilead; of Jonah, thrice over—in Judæa, in Phœnicia, and at Nineveh. It may be well to notice the probable cause of this uncertainty of Jewish as contrasted with the certainty of Egyptian and, we might add, of European tradition on the subject of tombs. However strongly the reverence for sacred graves may have been developed in the Jews of later times, the ancient Israelites never seem to have entertained the same feeling of regard for the resting-places or the remains of their illustrious dead as was carried to so high a pitch in the earlier Pagan, or in the later Christian, world. 'Let me bury my dead out of my sight;' 'No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day;' express, if not the general feeling of the Jewish nation, at least the general spirit of the Old Testament. Every one knows the most signal instance in which this

indifference was manifested. Somewhere, doubtless, near the walls of the old Jerusalem, or buried under its ruins, is 'the new sepulchre hewn in the rock,' where 'the body of Jesus was laid;' but the precise spot, never indicated by the Evangelists, was probably unknown to the next generation, and will, in all likelihood, remain a matter of doubt always. In this respect, the controversy regarding the holy sepulchre is an illustration of a general fact in sacred topography. Modern pilgrims are troubled at the supposition that such a locality should have been lost. The Israelites and the early Christians would have been surprised if it had been preserved."—pp. 147-9.

This then is the theory with which we have to deal. Upon the most superficial perusal, the account appears to be one which contains so many contradictions and counter-statements, that the reader is tempted to believe, what elsewhere is acknowledged, that these periods did not emanate from a single brain and were not the production of a single pen. Indeed they exhibit in a marked manner a peculiarity much noticed—a want of the logical faculty—a faculty which, if added to the writer's other gifts, would make his talents more dangerous than they really are. Let us now endeavour to disentangle this matted web of inconsistency.

The division of the chapter on the general features of Palestine, which Mr. Stanley has ticketed in the margin "sepulchres," contains one statement, which for shortness sake may be called essential, and many which may be termed accidental. In point of fact there are two principal points which stand conspicuously out from the rest. One—the least important—is placed in the fore-front of the discussion: the other—the more important—brings up the rear. These two propositions, expressed nearly in the author's words, enunciate the opinion that, first, the sepulchres of Syria are "next to the wells, the most authentic memorials of past times;" and, secondly, that amongst the Jews, "reverence for sacred graves" there was none—and more, that "indifference was manifested" on the subject. It is unnecessary to waste much time in discussing the value of the first and less important statement, for the author has clearly not perceived the inconsistency of two assertions, to both of which it were difficult to assent. For if the numberless sepulchres which abound in Palestine were "authentic memorials of past times," the descendants of great and good men could hardly have "manifested indifference" or want of "reverence for sacred graves." On the other hand if the Jews had been indifferent to the remains of their ancestors, there could not have well been so many "authentic memorials" by which one "successive age is bound" to its predecessor. This we venture to call dilemma

the first. Hence the leading theory which Mr. Stanley would inculcate, and which it is alone intended to discuss in this place, in brief, is as follows:—that the early Israelites were regardless of, and indifferent to, the “resting places or the remains of their illustrious dead.” The secondary assertions by which the principal one is defended or illustrated being more numerous, though not less fallacious, we propose to deal with first.

“Next to the wells of Syria,” Mr. Stanley thus writes, “the most authentic memorials of past time are the sepulchres, and partly for the same reason.” On turning back a single leaf the reader discovers the reason. “The rocky soil” in which the first are dug, and “the living limestone rock” in which the others are excavated: such are the causes from which both tombs and wells “serve as the links by which each successive age is bound to the other in a manner which at first sight would be thought almost incredible.” This then is one statement. A little further on will be discovered that these “authentic memorials of past time,” these “links” of successive ages, resolve themselves into the tombs of Aaron, of Joseph, of Rachel, of king David, and of the Father of the Faithful, the graves of five “illustrious dead,” and these not all determinable at the present day. Can it be said with any regard for the proprieties of language, that when of the whole body of Jewish saints and worthies, of the patriarchs and prophets, of the lawgivers and judges, of the kings hereditary and usurping, of the high priests and historians, to leave out of consideration less eminent or renowned persons unrecorded save in the Book of Life, the recognized sites of sepulchres amounts at the most to five, can it surely be said that with the exception of the wells “the most authentic memorials of past time” are the tombs of Palestine? Here we discover inconsistency the second.

Mr. Stanley instances the example of the ancient Egyptians to support his theory. No instance could be more unhappy. In the peculiarity of their construction, the Jewish, or rather some of them, do resemble, “though on a smaller scale, the tombs of Upper Egypt.” When however we are led on and told that “as there the traveller is confronted with the names and records of men who lived thousands of years ago, so also in the excavations of the valleys (of Syria) he knows that he sees what were the last resting places of the generations contemporary with Joshua, Samuel, and David,” we beg to demur. It is certainly true that the Egyptian tombs carry upon their walls their history, and as such, are authentic memorials. But it is by no means self-evident that because we are acquainted with the date and age of some graves which themselves disclose these details,

we should be able to determine the history of others, which fail to tell us anything whatever. That the latter is the condition of the Syrian sepulchres, the author himself owns: "Instead (he says) of acres of inscriptions which cover the tombs of Egypt, not a single letter has been found in any sepulchre in Palestine." Hence it appears to us, that the traveller, who, in the many excavations in Syria, "knows that he sees the last resting place" of any given generation, must be endued with prescience unattainable to the generality of pilgrims. If likewise the possibility of an approximate date being assigned to any class or range of tombs be doubted, "the identification of these sepulchres even with their individual occupants," as Mr Stanley suggests, is not only "not so improbable as might be otherwise supposed," but, on his own hypothesis, is absolutely impossible. On which same theory it appears, contrary to the author's statement, that although the graves of Osirei and Rameses can still be ascertained, there is something improbable, that, as "authentic memorials," "the tombs of the patriarchs may have survived the lapse of twenty or thirty centuries."

Another thought forces itself upon the reader incidental to the tombs of Upper Egypt. The subjects of the Pharaohs we know, on the subject of sepulchres held opinions diametrically opposed to those Mr. Stanley would persuade us were current amongst the Jews. The Egyptians emphatically were not indifferent to the remains of their "illustrious dead." On one point, however, at least, the practice of the two nations appears to be identical. The great mass of both races were buried with either no memorials at all, or with those of an unenduring and a temporary character. It is not for a moment pretended that the authentic sepulchres of Egypt contain the remains of the Egyptian plebs. Nor can we do Mr. Stanley the injustice to suppose he imagines that "the excavations which surround either Shiloh, or Shechem, or Bethel, or Jerusalem, or any other city, ancient or modern, could suffice for the interment of a decimal part of the Israelitish commonality. Hence we arrive at the fact that for a certain and comparatively small portion of both nations, sepulchres of a character distinct and more expensive, different and more lasting, were employed. But we will go a step further. We will call to mind the many generations Israel, as a nation, were in bondage to the Pharaohs. We will bring to recollection the temptation which a rude people, brought into contact with a civilized one, runs of being indoctrinated with the manners and customs, the peculiarities and the prejudices, the thoughts and ideas, of the more refined class. We will remind the reader that not only the Jews were thus tempted,

but that they succumbed to the temptation; that not only did they learn the habits of the Egyptians, but copied their vices; that not only did they imbibe their peculiarities, but became imbued with their prejudices; not only did they practise their refinements, but imitated their sins. These facts are patent to every careful reader of Holy Scripture, and we therefore do not stop to prove what has been ably done by others. We shall only add that, giving these considerations due weight, we shall probably be not indisposed to admit that some common cause was at the bottom of so much similarity; or inclined to deny that, in the matter of sepulchres, so great identity could have arisen from other than unity of purpose. Being, then, assured that the ancient Egyptians were animated by "reverence for sacred graves," can we forbear to think that the Jews were, in their own manner and mode of shewing it, influenced by the same natural and world-wide sentiment?

With the particular instances which the author produces of "authentic memorials," he does not seem altogether satisfied; nor upon his own principle can the term authentic be applied to most of them. Of the case on Mount Hor he only presumes to state, that it "must be at least the spot believed by Josephus to mark the grave of Aaron." The tomb of Joseph, he says, truly enough, "must be near one of the two monuments pointed out as such in the opening of the vale of Shechem." He might have continued, with equal truth, that it need not have been either of the traditional sites; and that both, by no possibility, could be "authentic." The sepulchre which is called the tomb of Rachel, we read, "exactly agrees with the spot described as a little way from Bethlehem,"—a description which would suit an indefinite number of places in the vicinity of that holy region. The tomb of David, we are told, "may perhaps be still found under the mosque which bears his name on modern Zion." And, "beyond all reasonable doubt," the cave of Macpelah is concealed by the mosque at Hebron. "With these exceptions," Mr. Stanley adds, "we must rest satisfied with the general rather than with the particular interest of the tombs of Palestine;" whilst quite forgetful of his example of Egypt, "the proof of identity, in each special instance," depending "almost entirely on the locality." Thus it seems that only two of the five "authentic memorials" are sufficiently free from doubt to allow the author to speak positively about them. The remaining three are considered to involve a doubt; whilst but a single one, or, at the most, two, bear the characteristic affinity to Egyptian sepulchres which Mr. Stanley is so anxious to claim. Such are a few more of the inconsistencies we are unable to reconcile.

Mr. Stanley next endeavours to cast a suspicion over all traditional sepulchral sites, by asserting that the Mussulman conquerors of Syria were influenced by such "a passion for erecting mosques over the tombs of celebrated saints" that many fictitious sepulchres" are pointed out, and doubt exists upon all. This course is at once ungenerous and unwise. The argument cuts both ways, and tells equally against those tombs which are described as "authentic," and those which are rejected as apocryphal. Mr. Stanley then digresses into an examination of Mahometan sites, which, as we cannot see the connexion with the subject matter of his section, we have taken the liberty to throw below into a foot note.^a

We now come to the point towards which all Mr. Stanley's arguments have really, though not openly, been tending. In a word, he wishes to cast a doubt upon the verity of the site of the holy sepulchre of our blessed Lord. He concludes the paragraph in which these doubts are propounded with the words, "Modern pilgrims are troubled at the supposition that such a locality should have been lost. The Israelites and early Christians would have been surprised if it had been preserved." Thus the author would place in one class the Jews and early Christians, as being both indifferent to "resting-places of their illustrious dead." We need only appeal to a rudimentary acquaintance with the history of the early Church to refute such an opinion. We need only turn to the pages of so familiar a work as Bingham's *Antiquities* for the satisfaction of such as are doubtful. Let any one read the section entitled, "Christians always careful to bury the dead even with the hazard of their lives." He will there find the words, "No act of charity is more magnified by the ancients than this of burying the dead: and therefore they venture upon it even with the hazard of their lives. In times of persecution, and in times of pestilential diseases, this could not be done without great danger, and yet they never scrupled about it in either case." Bingham then commemorates several holy men for particular zeal in this act of

^a "Even the most genuine sepulchres are received as such by the highest Mussulman authorities on grounds the most puerile. The mosque of Hebron is justly claimed by them as the sanctuary of the tomb of Abraham; but their reason for believing it is thus gravely stated in the *Touch of Hearts*, a work written by the learned Ali, son of Jafer-ar-Rayz, on the authenticity of the tombs of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob:— 'I rely,' he says, 'on the testimony of Abu Hosäisah, who thus expresses himself:— "It was said by the apostle of God, 'When the angel Gabriel made me take the nocturnal flight to Jerusalem, we passed over the tomb of Asaham; and he said, Descend, and make a prayer with two genuflexions; for here is the sepulchre of the father Abraham. Then we passed Bethlehem, and he said, Descend, for here was born thy brother Jesus. Then we came to Jerusalem.'""

corporeal charity, and adds: "Sometimes they ventured to steal away the bodies of the martyrs in the night, when they could not otherwise, either by money or entreaty, get liberty to bury them;" and that "there want not instances in the ancient martyrologies of some who became martyrs themselves for this excessive charity to their brethren." This truly is a curious manner of evincing indifference to the "resting-places" or the remains of "illustrious dead." So likewise is the method employed for preparing the body of the deceased for burial,—the washing it in water, the dressing it in robes, and the watching and attending it in the coffin. So again is the decent and orderly "exportation of the" corpse,—the particular orders of men appointed to superintend such offices, the ceremonial prescribed for funeral processions, the psalmody and orations, the oblation of the most holy Eucharist and prayer, the strewing of flowers on the grave, and the wearing of mourning apparel, the alms-deeds connected with the services, and the annual commemoration of the dead, and, lastly, the denial to certain persons of these sacred rites and ceremonies. If such practices do prove the "indifference" of the early Christians, the constitution of the mind, which accepts the proof, is of a very remarkable nature.

Thus much for the opinions of the early Christians. The question touching the Israelitish feeling on the matter of sepulchres cannot be so shortly dealt with. "It may be well to notice (says Mr. Stanley) the probable cause of this uncertainty of Jewish, as contrasted with the certainty of Egyptian, and, we might add, of European, tradition on the subject of tombs." We think another cause than that of "indifference" may be given. The author seems to hold to the theory that, because the reputed resting-places of the "illustrious dead" cannot at the expiration of two or three thousand years be authenticated, therefore we are to assume that they were never in any way particularized. Nothing appears more fallacious than this argument. We must remember the (in general) very different position in which we are placed with respect to the Jewish sepulchres and those with which they are contrasted—the Egyptian; the very means by which we are assured the latter people were not indifferent to the remains of their ancestors, are wanting to the former. It is unphilosophical in the extreme to argue from hence, that in another manner, and in a different way, the Jews were careless about the resting-place of their friends. And to make this the more apparent, we have only to consider the very false conclusions persons might have arrived at, on baseless assumptions, before the discovery of the Egyptian tombs, with

regard to the feelings of this very people. Let us remember the history of this peculiar people, the Jews—the establishment of the nation in the Holy Land—their continual state of warfare under the judges—the formation of the kingdom—the secession of the majority of the tribes—the intestine commotion of one portion of the nation, the foreign wars of the other, and the intermitting, partial, and permanent conquest and captivity of both—the return of the Jews—the re-establishment of order—the falling again under a foreign yoke—the rebellion and final destruction of Jerusalem as a Jewish city—and the dispersion of the Jews. Let us remember, besides, the early and middle age and modern history of the nation, and we shall perhaps conclude that, on *prima facie* grounds, it was not to be expected that the localities of sacred sites should be preserved, that it was highly improbable that they would be remembered. This of course does not affect the actual sentiments of the Jews: it merely alludes to the permanency of their memorials, or to the remembrance of future ages. When, however, in opposition to our preconceived notions, we find several sites acknowledged by an opponent of our theory as “authentic;” and when many more are pointed out to us as genuine by the present race of natives, we cannot fail to allow that, after all, the early Jews must have entertained some “feeling of regard for the resting-places of their dead.”

That the ancient people of God carried their sentiments “to so high a pitch,” as was the case “in the earlier Pagan, or in the later Christian world” is beside the question. We are alone desirous of asserting what we believe was never before even questioned, and what is now only denied for a certain by no means obscure reason, that such a feeling did exist among the Jews. But however much we may be surprised at Mr. Stanley’s novel theory, our astonishment at his novel method of supporting his position is far greater. We can hardly believe our eyes when we read that the two quotations from Holy Scripture by which alone he tries to establish his opinion, and which he declares “express, if not the general feeling of the Jewish nation, at least the general spirit of the Old Testament,” are the following:—“Let me bury my dead out of my sight,” and “No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day.” Could any instances have been more unfortunate? With respect to the great Lawgiver, it is we believe the generally received opinion that it was to prevent any great demonstration of affection or veneration, to give no opportunity to the bestowal upon the prophet, like whom there “arose none since in Israel, whom the Lord knew face to face,” of anything approaching divine honours, that the Almighty

was pleased to conceal the remains of his servant. There was much danger in such a proceeding, so accustomed hereditarily, if not personally, had the nation become to the traditions and customs of the Egyptians. However, whether this be the true explanation or not—and its truth or falsehood affects the argument in no degree—it was rather rash to allude at all to the great Lawgiver; first, because the children of Israel did shew him such marks of respect as lay in their power, by mourning “for Moses in the plains of Moab thirty days;” secondly, because the historian, moved by the Holy Spirit of God, thought it necessary to record for the instruction of all time the place and manner of the deaths and burials of the two holy persons next in authority to the leader himself, of Miriam and of Aaron, and particularly mentions the time of mourning for the high priest; and thirdly, because at the very time when the Israelites are accused of evincing indifference to the “remains of their illustrious dead,” the embalmed body of the patriarch Joseph was actually being conveyed, after the forty years’ wandering, to its last resting place in the land of promise.

Nor is the example of the great patriarch Abraham less antagonistic to the author’s theories. “Let me bury my dead out of my sight.” Do these words in themselves, any more than the words, “No man knoweth of his sepulchre unto this day,” imply indifference? If they do, they are strangely out of harmony with the whole tenor of the narrative of which they form a part. Let us then briefly examine this question. Some years previous to the event to which allusion is made, we find Abraham and Lot dividing the land between them on the occasion of a quarrel between their respective herdsmen. Surely then, notwithstanding the patriarch’s courteous form of application to the sons of Heth for a place in which to found a family sepulchre, Abraham might have found an innumerable number of spots in which to bury his dead. He preferred, however, to obtain a legal claim to such a spot. He communed with the people of the land; and eventually he purchased for “four hundred shekels of silver, current money with the merchant,” the cave of Machpelah. Nor can we fail to notice the precise and legal phraseology in which the contract is drawn up:—“And the field of Ephron which was in Machpelah, which was before Mamre, the field and the cave which was therein, and all the trees that were in the field, and in all the borders round about, were made sure unto Abraham for a possession in the presence of the children of Heth, before all that went in at the gate of the city.” This is perhaps a transcription of the earliest legal document in existence, and is extremely curious on that account. Though what grounds can

be gleaned from it to sanction a charge of "indifference" on the part of Abraham towards his "illustrious dead," we cannot conceive. The very reverse seems to be the case. Not only was a locality demanded where any might be taken; not only was it asked, but bought; not only was it bought, but paid for at a considerable sum "as a king unto a king;" not only was a cave begged "in the end of the field," but the whole field was purchased; not only was the whole field purchased, but even the "trees that were therein, and in all the borders round about" were made sure unto Abraham, and were ratified unto him at the gate of the city. Really, any one particular in this transaction would be sufficient to prove to an unprejudiced person the sentiment which actuated the patriarch: the cumulative evidence is such as the most determined adherence to prejudged views alone could withstand.

The opinion which generally prevails on the subject of the sentiments of the Jews concerning sepulchres, is certainly opposed to that of Mr. Stanley. The Holy Scriptures were given us for some higher reason than to indoctrinate us into the manners and customs on the subject of tombs, or otherwise of the Israelites; hence we must not expect any very decided proofs from this source. We can only glean incidentally what may prove to be the truth—and that perhaps in straggling fragments, few and far between. However, what is to be picked up on this matter, is all of one description; and we are not troubled to separate what tells for us, from that which tells against us. The evidence all points one way in the accidental remarks concerning the dead, the treatment of the deceased, and in many instances, in the prophetic judgments for sin. We will adduce a few cases in proof of these assertions. The course which the Father of the Faithful adopted on the death of his wife has been already mentioned. On the decease of their father we learn that both Isaac and Ishmael assisted at his burial. The cave of Machpelah was the spot, and we are reminded by the inspired historian of the history of the sepulchre, and of its present occupant:—"The field which Abraham purchased of the sons of Heth; there was Abraham buried and Sarah his wife." At this early period of the story of the Jewish race, nothing of "indifference" to the remains of the dead is evinced either by the living in their conduct, or by the departed in his wishes. The words of Esau betray incidentally, even in a wicked and profane person, a certain respect for the usages of society, in waiting for the completion of the "days of mourning for" his father ere he should execute his revenge upon his brother Jacob.

Again, on the death of Isaac, we read that the same mark of

respect which was paid to Abraham was not neglected towards himself. Jacob was residing with the patriarch, but Esau came from Mount Seir, and both sons followed their father to the grave. Dying at Hebron, it is impossible to think that Isaac's resting place was not the cave of Machpelah, where in after years the remains of Jacob were placed, as well as those of Rebekah and of Leah. This, however, is not recorded in its historical place, but is mentioned in the last words of Jacob.

Again, in the case of Rachel, no indifference is displayed by her husband. "And Rachel died, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem. And Jacob set a pillar upon her grave: that is the pillar of Rachel's grave unto this day:" so Deborah also, Rebekah's nurse, died, and she was buried beneath Bethel under an oak. Neither upon his own approaching end does the patriarch himself give sanction to a charge of indifference; but he made his sons swear not to leave his remains in a foreign land. His dying words were not neglected. "Joseph commanded his servants the physicians to embalm his father and forty days were fulfilled for him; for so are the days of those which are embalmed; and the Egyptians mourned for him threescore and ten days." Now read the account of Jacob's burial in the fiftieth chapter of Genesis, and say whether or not it savours of indifference. "And Joseph went up to bury his father; and with him went up all the servants of Pharaoh, the elders of his house, and all the elders of the land of Egypt, and all the house of Joseph, and his brethren, and his father's house; and there went up with him both chariots and horsemen; and it was a very great company." Further we need not extract. The same oath which Jacob took of his sons, does Joseph take of his brethren: "Ye shall carry up my bones from hence," and "they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin in Egypt." Of Miriam, Aaron, and Moses we have already spoken. After the occupation of the western side of Jordan, Joseph was buried in Shechem, and Eleazar the son of Aaron "was buried in the hill that pertained to Phineas his son, which was given him in Mount Ephraim."

If the Jews were so indifferent about the "remains of their illustrious dead," it certainly is wonderful that the sepulchres of so many of their great men were thus particularized. Joshua, the second leader of the Israelites, is another instance. We read, "They buried him in the border of his inheritance in Timnath-serah, which is in Mount Ephraim, on the north side of the Hill Gaash."

It is needless to go over the whole number of instances which the Old Testament furnishes of respect for the dead, and

of care for their burial in the sepulchres of their fathers; such as those of Gideon, and Jephthah, and Samson, and Samuel, and Saul, and David, and of the kings of Judah. Ruth's touching speech to her mother-in-law speaks the same language: "Where thou diest will I die, and there will I be buried." So too is the denunciation spoken by God against the old prophet in the First Book of Kings (xiii. 22): "Thy carcase shall not come unto the sepulchre of thy father." And in a similar spirit is the prophecy against Jeroboam: "Him that dieth in the city shall the dogs eat, and him that dieth in the field shall fowls of the air eat." Similar is the fearful fate threatened to Baasha. For Abijah, son of Jeroboam, "Israel mourned." So Rehoboam was buried with his fathers, and so was Abijam and Asa; and so also of the other kings of Judah. And Baasha was buried in Tirzah; and Omri in Samaria; and Ahab in Samaria, to whose family the same divine vengeance as to Jeroboam and Baasha is prophesied; and so too of other kings of Israel.

We think enough has been said to shew that the Jews were by no means so indifferent to the remains of their dead as Mr. Stanley would have us believe; and to prove that such a sentiment, is not the "general spirit of the Old Testament," or the "general feeling of the Jewish nation."

"Every one," Mr. Stanley continues, "Every one knows the most signal instance in which this indifference was manifested. Somewhere, doubtless, near the walls of old Jerusalem, or buried under its ruins, is the 'new sepulchre hewn in the rock,' where 'the body of Jesus was laid;' but the precise spot, never indicated by the Evangelists, was probably unknown to the next generation, and will, in all likelihood, remain a matter of doubt always." It is clearly out of the question to enter into a discussion upon the site of the Holy Sepulchre. Its identity has been acknowledged by most persons competent to judge, and been proved by persons able to substantiate their opinions. That some objections have to be surmounted, no one who knows anything of the matter denies: but that more weighty considerations have to be set aside by modern doubters is equally evident. With Mr. Stanley's assertion, however, we have now alone to deal; and the statement, so positively laid down, that the 'precise spot was never indicated by the Apostles,' does fill us with astonishment. St. John says, "And he, bearing his cross, went forth into a place called a place of a skull, which is called in the Hebrew Golgotha, where they crucified him;" and afterwards adds, "Now in the place where he was crucified there was a garden; and in the garden a new sepulchre, wherein

was never man yet laid;" and "there laid they Jesus." It seems to us positively false to say that the place was not "indicated." If a spot known to the people by a characteristic name, close to the walls of the city, if a garden in this spot, if a cave in this garden, be not an indication of the Holy Sepulchre, we know not how the apostle could have more clearly, to those for whom he wrote, have indicated the spot. Are those localities of which Mr. Stanley speaks as "authentic" "indicated" more exactly?—the tombs of Aaron, Joseph, Rachel, David, or Abraham? the rocky cave on Mount Hor, the tomb of Joseph, "one of two monuments," the sepulchre of Rachel, the resting-place of David, or the cave of Machpelah? It is impossible not to see the *animus* which inspired this sentence. It is impossible not to rebel against the statement it contains.

With respect to the assertion that the precise spot "was probably unknown to the next generation" it is also impossible to go into details. It seems, however, somewhat unphilosophical in the matter of popular tradition to assume, where historic evidence ceases, the non-existence of the record prior to that date. In every historical fact reports must precede records. In all tradition, verbal testimony must precede written. Even in written tradition it is not always certain whether or not we possess the original documents. And, therefore, to dogmatize upon the origin of a tradition, be it of fact or fiction, or to pretend to point to a time antecedent to which tradition did not exist, either in written or unwritten records, is altogether opposed to sound criticism. To the *prima facie* view of the case we can add, however, historical testimony against Mr. Stanley, namely, that of the martyr Lucian, a testimony which has lately been brought to light in the *Journal of Sacred Philology*, and extracted from the publications of the late venerable Dr. Routh. To this journal we must then refer the reader.

It is possible that in the next number these strictures may be continued.

O. S.

THE LEGEND OF ST. PETER'S PENITENTIAL FOOD.^a

CERTAIN sermons were preached in the Lent season of the present year, in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, at Oxford, and were afterwards published under the title of *Lenten Sermons*, etc. Dr. Pusey is the author of one of these, entitled *Repentance from love of God life-long*; in which is contained the following strange assertion :—

“Morning after morning, cock-crowing after cock-crowing, St. Peter wept his fall. Some lentile broth, of the daily value of a farthing, was for his whole life-long the penitential food of him by whose hands God wrought special miracles, by whose shadow passing by he healed the sick, through whom he first admitted both Jews and Gentiles into the Church; to whom first in dignity among the other apostles, he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven.”

When we consider the ecclesiastical position of him who has endeavoured (doubtless sincerely, if ignorantly) to pass, from the pulpit and the press, such suspicious coin as lawful money, and take into account not a few of the signs of the times in which we are living, it certainly does appear to us that it may be both expedient and useful to shew that no candid mind can reasonably refuse to regard the tradition in question as a childish legend, neither founded upon, nor agreeable to, the written Word of God. Indeed, it receives no support from the facts of the scriptural records, whether we think this supposed farthing's worth of lentile broth to have constituted the whole of St. Peter's daily food after his denial of his Master, or look upon it as a small commemorative penitential portion, which he took early every morning.

On the former view, one day at least, and on the latter, one morning at least, must be excepted; as will be at once evident, if we attentively consider the interesting and instructive events that are immediately connected with the risen Lord's *third* appearance to his disciples near the sea of Tiberias, John xxi. 14.

It may be assumed as certain, that the first two visits of our Lord to his assembled disciples after the resurrection took place

^a The writer of this paper addressed a few lines on the subject of this legend to the editor of one of our most respectable evening journals (*the St. James's Chronicle*). Afterwards, on considering the important and influential position of Dr. Pusey as a clergyman and as a professor in the University of Oxford, he determined to shew at greater length how contradictory is this legend to the plain statements of the New Testament, and to send his Essay to the editor of the *Journal of Sacred Literature and Biblical Record*.

at Jerusalem, on two successive first days of the week. It is true that on the very morning on which he arose from the dead, Jesus sent a gracious message to his disciples—"Tell my brethren that they go into Galilee, there shall they see me." This injunction, however, was of course not intended to interfere with the divinely appointed arrangements of the passover-season; nor would the disciples feel at liberty to leave Jerusalem for Galilee, before the close of the seven days of unleavened bread, unless the Lord should expressly command their earlier departure. Thus the appointed order of the passover, together with the prohibition against travelling on the sabbath, would prevent their setting out on their homeward journey until the first day of the succeeding week. But when this day arrived, they would naturally wish to spend it at Jerusalem, not without the hope and expectation of being a second time favoured with the presence of their risen Lord, who had already appeared to them on the first day of the preceding week, the day of his resurrection. This explanation furnishes us with the reason why the disciples had not yet returned into Galilee, but were still tarrying in Jerusalem on the second Lord's day after the crucifixion—all being assembled together (for Thomas was now with them) in the same room in which they had already heard from the lips of him who had so recently triumphed over death and the grave, the welcome salutation—"Peace be unto you."

It could not be doubted that in the course of the second week the disciples complied with their Lord's injunction, and found themselves once more in Galilee, in the immediate vicinity of their vessels and nets, and of the lake which had been familiar to them from their childhood. And as Jesus was no longer personally with them, as their daily friend, associate, counsellor, and guide, they were already entering into the position of those who are to walk by faith rather than by sight.

As the two preceding appearances of the risen Jesus to his assembled disciples were each on a Lord's day (*i. e.*, on the first day of the week), and as it seems almost certain (judging from that which soon became the established usage in the apostolic times and onwards), that it was the purpose of him who was "Lord also of the sabbath-day," to turn the attention of his Church from the Jewish sabbath to the first day of the week, the day of his resurrection—we shall have little difficulty in regarding it as reasonably and scripturally probable^b that our Lord's

^b It will doubtless be regarded by many as highly probable that this view is correct. The arguments, however, advanced in this paper do not depend for their validity on the truth of the supposition that our Lord's third appearance to his apostles occurred upon the first day of the week.

third personal appearance, as recorded in John xxi., was also on the first day of the third week.

If that which seems to be so probable, may be assumed as true, then we must think that the events recorded in the commencement of the twenty-first chapter of St. John's evangelical history, occurred on a Saturday evening, to borrow the terms of our own weekday nomenclature. Accordingly, on that evening, after sunset, when the Jewish sabbath was ended, and secular pursuits could be again lawfully resumed, we find assembled together (probably in the house of Peter and Andrew) Peter and six other apostles, among whom were Thomas, who had been absent at the Lord's first appearance in Jerusalem; Nathanael, who was not of Capernaum but of Cana, and John (xxi. 7). We may also conclude that Andrew the brother of Peter, and James the brother of John, were present. It was scarcely a fortnight after the paschal feast, which was celebrated at the time of the full moon—this being the third Saturday after the crucifixion, which is universally believed to have occurred on a Friday—and therefore about the time of the new moon.

In order to deal fairly with these disciples, we must not forget that on the two recent occasions the risen Jesus appears to have shewed himself to the apostles, not on the Saturday evening shortly after sunset, but in the afternoon of the following day, *i. e.*, on a Sunday afternoon. Thus it is most likely that Peter and his companions were not at all expecting another personal appearance of the Lord earlier than the afternoon of the next day. And this supposition would simply and naturally account for the fact, that only seven out of the eleven were then present. For it leaves us at liberty to think that the absent four would possibly have joined their brethren on the following day.

The seven had most probably shared with their neighbours in the usual sabbath-services of the synagogue; for their manner and bearing plainly teach us that they were no longer under the bondage of those feelings of apprehension for their personal safety, which had led them to sit together when at Jerusalem with closed doors, through fear of the Jews. When the sun had sunk beneath the horizon, the fishermen of Capernaum^c would prepare themselves to enter afresh upon the duties and labours

^c It was to Capernaum that our Lord went when he ceased to reside at Nazareth, Matt. iv. 13; and it appears from ver. 18—22 of the same chapter, that Peter and Andrew, as well as James and John, were then living at Capernaum. The two former seem to have been natives of Bethsaida, which was also the town of Philip, John i. 44. It was most probably from the house of Simon Peter (Mark i. 29), that he and his six fellow-disciples went forth, on the evening in question, to the sea of Tiberias.

of their calling. Old recollections, apparently not duly met and restrained by deep thoughts of the death and resurrection, of the grace and love of Jesus, seem to have suddenly revived in the bosom of Peter, with more of their former power and influence than was suitable for so eminent a disciple of Christ at such a season,—a disciple whose special duty it was to shew to his companions an example of patient faith and expectation, in obedience to his Lord's express injunction, "When thou art converted, strengthen thy brethren." Peter's restless energy of character would make him impatient of remaining inactive and unemployed, and he yielded to a lingering attachment to the pursuits of his former calling.

Jesus was no longer with them in person, to guide them hour by hour by his word and example. The Pentecostal effusion had not yet taken place. Left awhile to themselves we cannot wonder if, through the infirmity of human nature, they were for a moment forgetful of their high position as the chosen servants of the risen Lord of life and glory. Were they not in the long familiar vicinity of the sea of Galilee,—those waters with which, at least in the case of Peter and Andrew, James and John, so many cherished recollections of childhood, youth, and manhood had been associated? And was not the moonless night peculiarly favourable to the fisherman's occupation? It may have seemed expedient, perhaps they might have thought it necessary, to procure a moderate supply of food by the aid of their nets, though doubtless their Lord's example had often taught them to be content with only barley cakes at their ordinary meals, without the addition of fish to give a greater relish to their plain and homely food. Yet even then we might have expected Peter to say—"Let not more of us than are really required, go away to the boat and net; let us not all be absent together, lest, haply, the Lord come unto the house when all are absent, and find none to welcome him." And, surely, if Peter had already begun to restrict himself to his daily scanty portion of lentile pottage, no one of that small band should have been more ready to remain in the house to meet the Lord should he suddenly appear.

Let us, however, proceed with the narrative. Peter surrenders himself for a time to old associations and habits, and his heart is again with his vessels and nets. He forgets for a brief space that he is Cephas (Peter, John i. 42), an apostle of the risen Messiah, and thinks, speaks, and acts once more as Simon-Barjona, Simon the fisherman, a son of Jona, who had also, most probably, been a fisherman. He suddenly declares what he has resolved to do, and, speaking aloud, perhaps in the

tone of a leader who expects to be followed by those around him, says, "I go a fishing." The earnestness of his manner and example prevails, and with one accord his fellow-disciples say, "We go with thee." Action follows speech, and all "go forth, and immediately enter the vessel."

An unseen friend was watching over them, whose name and goodness, though deeply cherished in their hearts, were not at that hour uppermost in their thoughts. The Evangelist John, who was one of the company, informs us that "on that night they caught nothing." Having laboured unsuccessfully while left to themselves, they were again to learn, through a fresh lesson, how much could be done when the Master was with them. "When the morning was now come, Jesus stood on the shore; but the disciples knew not that it was Jesus. Then Jesus saith unto them, Children, have ye any meat (*προσφάγιον*)? They answered him, No." They have not yet discovered who the friendly stranger is, but it will very soon be impossible for John, the disciple whom Jesus loved, to remain longer in ignorance and uncertainty. "And Jesus said unto them, Cast the net on the right side of the ship, and ye shall find. They cast, therefore, and now they were not able to draw it for the multitude of fishes." How marvellous is all this! They have been wholly unsuccessful during the more favourable season of the night, and now, at a stranger's bidding, they cast the net, and it is at once filled with fish. A very similar nocturnal failure and successful day-light trial had (Luke v. 1—8) formerly occurred on the last night and morning that Simon-Barjona was on the lake of Gennesareth in the regular pursuit of his calling as a fisherman, although it was not at so early an hour. And now that, after toiling the whole night in vain, they are unable to draw the net for the multitude of fishes, do not Peter's memory, head, and heart, unite at once to teach him who is standing on the shore, and are not his eyes eagerly turned to that direction? And is he not the first to discover and announce the welcome tidings? The evangelical narrative does not give an affirmative answer to these questions, but rather shews that Peter learned from another what he ought almost instinctively to have discovered for himself. "Therefore (on account of the miraculous draught of fishes) that disciple whom Jesus loved (John) saith unto Peter, It is the Lord. Now when Simon Peter *heard* that it was the Lord," a conviction that it must indeed be so flashed upon his mind, and "he girt his fisher's coat unto him (for he was naked), and did cast himself into the sea," as if eager to be near the Master whom he had thrice denied, and by whom he had been graciously and

fully forgiven. As we see Peter thus casting himself into the water and hastening to the shore, do we not feel that he loved much, for much had been forgiven to him?

In due time all reached the land. It would appear that guests were expected; for they saw before them "a fire, and fish laid thereon;" nor was bread wanting. He who had, by his creative power, caused five barley loaves and two small fishes to satisfy the hunger of five thousand persons, had graciously made this provision for his toilworn and hungry disciples. Jesus tells them also to bring of the fish which they had just caught, and for which they are indebted to his power and goodness: and when Simon Peter had assisted in hauling the net ashore, it was found "full of great fishes, one hundred and fifty-three." And now their kind host (whom none ventured to question, as they knew him to be the Lord), aware that the night's labour must have prepared them to relish the morning meal, graciously calls them to partake of the food which had been provided for them, saying, "Come and dine."^d Not content with having thus invited them, the risen Jesus, yet further to encourage them, with his own hands, "taketh bread and giveth them, and fish likewise." It certainly was not the Lord's intention that the disciples should have a scanty and insufficient repast. And can we think that Peter was merely a spectator, and that he refused to take one morsel of the bread and fish thus graciously provided? Do we not rather feel certain that the pardoned and restored apostle gratefully accepted his risen Master's proffered bounty, and enjoyed a refreshing and sufficient, if temperate, meal? Nor are we less sure that when Peter, on the preceding evening, in a manner which may almost be called hurried and off-hand, suddenly went forth and hastened to the boat, he did not remember to take with him the penitential farthing's worth of lentile broth for the next morning. The perusal of the Evangelist's interesting narrative should teach Dr. Pusey, unless he be determined to prefer childish patristic legends to simple Scripture testimony, that it is little less than morally certain that, up to the hour of that early hospitable meal near the sea of Tiberias, where the risen Jesus was the kind host, and the seven apostles his favoured and grateful guests, Peter had not yet commenced the practice of his supposed morning penance of lentile pottage; and that it is scarcely less certain that, if he had not yet begun his imaginary broth penance, he never began it at all.

^d Of course the early hour teaches us that the Evangelist is speaking of the morning meal.

Let us next look at two or three facts in the history of Peter subsequently to the pentecostal effusion of the Holy Spirit, and see how far they agree with the supposition that about a farthing's worth of lentile pottage formed the daily sustenance of the illustrious apostle after he had denied the Lord, and been fully and freely forgiven by him. For, after all, this is surely the plain and obvious interpretation of Dr. Pusey's words: "*some lentile broth, of the daily value of a farthing, was, for his whole life long, the penitential food of him (Peter) by whose hands God wrought special miracles.*"

In Acts xi. 5—8, we have a second record of Peter's well-known vision of living creatures. When the heavenly voice said to him, "Arise, Peter, slay and eat," he does not reply, "Nay, far be it from me to do so. I am under what is little less sacred to me than a solemn vow to refrain from all food, except a scanty daily portion of lentile pottage." Quite otherwise. He reverently, but firmly, protests against compliance with the injunction for a very different reason. "Not so, Lord; for nothing common or unclean hath at any time entered into my mouth." And if we turn to the last verse of the preceding chapter, we read that, when Cornelius and those with him had been baptized at Cæsarea, the pious centurion "prayed Peter to tarry certain days." And it is most probable that Peter complied with this request; as the newly-baptized Gentiles would both need, and long for, further instruction in the doctrine of the Gospel. At all events, it seems to be certain, beyond dispute, that Peter was, on that day at least, a guest at the table of Cornelius.* For "when Peter was come up to Jerusalem, they that were of the circumcision contended with him, saying, Thou wentest in unto men uncircumcised, and *didst eat with them.*"

The plain and comprehensive purpose of the remarkable vision at Joppa would seem to be the overthrow of the whole barrier of *Jewish* prejudice—social as well as religious—which kept the converted Jew from the Gentiles, and especially from the converted Gentiles. How strong that barrier was may be learned from the words addressed by this apostle to Cornelius and those in his house (Acts xi. 28): "Ye know how that it is an unlawful thing for a man that is a Jew to keep company, or come unto one of another nation; but God hath shewed me

* Cornelius must have been well acquainted with the leading Jewish prohibitions with respect to clean and unclean meats. He would rejoice to shew hospitality to Peter and the six Hebrew brethren (Acts xi. 12) who accompanied him; and his Christian regard and reverence for the apostle from whom he had just heard the words of eternal life, would make him watchful to prevent the appearance on his table of anything which might offend Jewish customs and prejudices.

that I should not call any man common or unclean." The charge against Peter, as we have just seen, was twofold,—(1.) "Thou wentest in to men uncircumcised, and (2.) didst eat with them." And he must be understood as admitting the truth of both charges, and as justifying himself on both points by the vision and the descent of the Holy Spirit upon the believing Gentiles even before their baptism. It would appear as if "they of the circumcision," who, at Jerusalem, brought forward these charges against the apostle, were as yet wholly ignorant of Peter's (supposed) invariable daily custom of restricting himself to a scanty portion of penitential food. Surely if Cornelius were permitted to appear among us for a single hour, his plain statement of that which occurred under his own roof would cause Dr. Pusey to regret his advocacy of an improbable legend, which is as contrary to the spirit as it unquestionably is to the letter of the New Testament.

St. Paul, an apostle not less illustrious and eminent than Peter, writes (Rom. xiv. 2, 3), "For one believeth that he may eat all things: another who is weak eateth herbs. Let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not." If we could believe (without one jot of Scriptural warrant for such belief) that Peter was really weak enough in Christian knowledge and judgment to take only lentile pottage, and of that not more than a scanty daily pittance, we should feel almost certain that Paul, who abode with Peter at Jerusalem during the fifteen days (Gal. i. 18), would not only pity his want of spiritual judgment, but also affectionately and strenuously urge him to emancipate himself from an unseemly self-chosen and self-willed bondage, so little in accordance with the pure and holy light, and grace, and love, and liberty, of the Gospel of Jesus Christ. St. Paul, however, altogether forbids our believing that the great apostle Peter took upon himself the yoke of such a form of superstitious penance, by laying before us the following statement of facts. "But when Peter was come to Antioch, I withstood him to the face, because he was to be blamed. For before that certain came from James, HE DID EAT WITH THE GENTILES; but when they were come, he withdrew, and separated himself, fearing them of the circumcision" (Gal. ii. 11, 12). And unto whom, and to what, did Peter (and even Barnabas also) thus withdraw and separate himself from the Gentile Christians? Surely not to ascetic solitude and a daily penance pittance of lentile pottage; but to join the party of the more strict and bigoted Jewish converts—to conform to their prejudices, present himself at their table, *and share in their daily meals.*

In connexion with, and as interpreted by, the facts already

alleged, the language of St. Peter, in his address to Cornelius, deserves our attention: "Him (Jesus) God raised up the third day, and shewed him openly, not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, even to us, who did eat and drink (*συνεφάγομεν καὶ συνεπίομεν*) with him after he rose from the dead." This passage may receive illustration from the Evangelist Luke's narrative of the risen Lord's first appearance to his assembled disciples: "And while they yet believed not for joy, and wondered, he said unto them, Have ye here any meat? And they gave him a piece of a broiled fish, and of an honeycomb. And he took it, and did eat before them" (Luke xxiv. 41, 43). May we not reasonably conclude that Peter, as well as the other apostles, had been partakers of similar food on that very day.^f

A few words on the first of Christ's three questions to Peter, as bearing upon the present subject: "Simon, son of Jonas, lovest thou me more than these (*ἀγαπᾷς με πλεῖον τούτων*)?" The subjective tendency of the minds of many readers of the sacred narrative would incline them, at first sight, to reject as tame and feeble the idea that Jesus intended to ask Peter if he loved his Lord more than he loved his boat and nets, and captured fish. Yet, perhaps, the more patiently we consider the matter, the less reluctant shall we be to accept this as the true interpretation. Our Lord had put great honour on Simon. He gave him the name of Cephas. He had also foretold his fall, when he should be tempted to deny his Master, and had directed him, when restored from that fall, to strengthen his brethren, having obtained through his own sad failure a personal experience of the sinful infirmity of man's fallen nature, and of the need of habitual watchfulness, as yet unknown to his fellow-disciples. After Peter's temptation and fall, he was freely and fully forgiven. The angel also, on the morning of the resurrection, was enjoined to take special notice of this fallen and restored apostle, and to say to the women, "Go your way, tell his disciples *and Peter*, that he goeth before you into Galilee" (Mark xvi. 7). Nay, Jesus himself condescended to appear on the day of his resurrection to the apostle who had thrice denied him, as if to confirm the grace and mercy of that look which at once pierced the conscience and the heart of Peter, and constrained him to go forth from the high priest's palace and "weep bitterly." Hence Peter should have been the very last to have

^f Our Lord having thus manifested to his disciples that he was really and corporally present with them, and not merely as a disembodied spirit, it was wholly unnecessary that he should afterwards, on his third appearance, near the sea of Tiberias, partake himself of the bread and fish there provided for his disciples.

given way to a lingering attachment to his former secular calling and pursuits, nor should he have been the foremost, in apparent temporary forgetfulness of his Lord, and without previous consultation with his brethren, in leading the way to their boat and nets. And he who knew the thoughts of the heart, was well aware that it was John and not Peter who, on discovering the miraculous draught of fishes, at once, and as it were instinctively, became aware that the seeming stranger on the shore was no other than the Lord himself. Peter, therefore, appeared to need (and, perhaps, his companions also, through him), a gentle and firm reproof, and to be taught that he must no longer feel and act as Simon the son of Jonas—as Simon the fisherman (probably the skilful and experienced fisherman who had excelled in, and loved, his calling), but as Cephas (Peter), the chosen and honoured apostle of Christ, whose one great privilege and absorbing duty it was to feed, instruct, and govern the lambs and sheep of Christ's flock. Had Peter already become such as Dr. Pusey's patristic legend represents him to have been, resolutely abstaining from all other nourishment than a daily small and self-denying portion of lentile pottage, he would scarcely have hastened, as he did, at the head of his brethren, to the boat and nets, and have entered with all his heart and energies, during a whole night, into the feelings, hopes, and labours of the fisherman's calling.

It may be regarded as not unfavourable to this interpretation of our Lord's first question to Peter, that he introduces each of the three questions with the words *Σίμων Ιωνᾶ*, "Simon,^g son of Jonas." Nor is it easy to suppose that our Lord's inquiry simply referred to the sad and thrice-repeated denial in the high priest's palace, as if he had said, "Dost thou, who didst thrice deny me, truly love me." It is, however, far more conceivable, that our Lord's look, tone, and manner, may have rendered his short question equivalent, in the mind of Peter, to something like the following: "How is it that thou, whose threefold denial I so freely and fully forgave, and whom I so solemnly charged to strengthen thy brethren in the path of separation from the world, and of faith, love, and obedience to me,—how is it, I ask, that thou hast, even for a single night, returned with all thy heart to the boat and nets from which I called thee to follow me?" And this view is not inconsistent with our Lord's three injunctions, "leave every earthly pursuit and devote thyself to

^g It is true that when Peter had uttered the memorable confession in the presence of his Master,—“Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God,”—Jesus replied, “Blessed art thou, Simon Barjona; for flesh and blood hath not revealed it to thee, but my Father which is in heaven” (Matt. xvi. 16, 17).

feed and rule my flock ;" while the calm and searching character of the Lord's dealing with his apostle on this memorable occasion, is manifested by his persevering in asking, until Peter felt distressed (*ἐλυπήθη*) at the thought of the question having been put to him a third time.

It would be presumptuous, not to say sinful, to compare the sins of Peter with those of Paul, in order to ascertain who was the greater offender of the two. The former had rashly and ignorantly exposed himself to a trial which, sincere as he was, his knowledge, faith, and love were yet too weak to encounter successfully. Yet, however painful and distressing were the recollections of his humiliation and fall, in the palace of the high priest, his fellow apostle, Paul, could remember how, as Saul of Tarsus, he had been guilty of far more revolting conduct, even of acts of deliberate cruelty, oppression, and persecution. He himself mentions these in his speech before Festus and Agrippa, in which he says, "Many of the saints did I shut up in prison, having received authority from the chief priests; and when they were put to death I gave my voice against them, and I punished them oft in every synagogue, *and compelled them to blaspheme* (*ἡνάγκαζον βλασφημεῖν*); and being exceedingly mad against them (*περισσῶς τε ἐμμαίνομενος αὐτοῖς*), I persecuted them even unto strange cities" (Acts xxvi. 10). We wonder not that with such recollections of his former career, this apostle should write, "I thank Christ Jesus our Lord, who hath enabled me, for that he counted me faithful, putting me into the ministry; who was before a blasphemer, and a persecutor, and injurious; but I obtained mercy, because I did it ignorantly and in unbelief." Nor are we surprised, when we consider that he persevered in this ignorance and unbelief against the preaching, testimony, and miracles of such servants of God as the apostles and Stephen, that he should speak of himself as "the chief of sinners" (1 Tim. i. 12, 15). And if, as legendary fables would have us believe, St. Peter prescribed to himself a permanent form of daily penance, in consequence of having denied his Master, how is it that St. Paul did not follow his example, adopting even a stricter form of self-denying penance, to mark how bitter to his soul was the remembrance of those days when, in the almost noon-tide brightness of apostolic preaching and miracles, he had obstinately rejected all heaven-supported testimony to the Messiahship of Jesus of Nazareth, blindly surrendering himself to a career of ignorant and unbelieving, but relentless and raging, blasphemy and persecution? One almost wonders that pious fraud, or diseased imagination, or both combined in the same person, did not find

an irresistible temptation to frame some marvellous legend of penitential discipline from the apostle's well-known and deeply instructive words, "I therefore so run, not as uncertainly; so fight I, not as one that beateth the air: but I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection: lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a castaway" (1 Cor. ix. 26, 27).

Our space forbids us (nor, indeed, does our subject exactly call us), to enter upon the discussion of the Christian doctrine of fasting, which is so clearly and beautifully explained in one of the Collects of the Church of England, where we are directed to pray for "grace to use such abstinence that we may ever obey Christ's godly motions in righteousness and true holiness, to his honour and glory." How far the system of penitential food, ascribed in the patristic legend to St. Peter, is in accordance with the instructive language of this prayer, may reasonably be doubted. The approvers and admirers of this legend would do well to weigh carefully the words of our apostle, "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. xiv. 17). The followers of Christ are doubtless called upon "to deny ungodliness and worldly lusts, and to mortify their members which are upon the earth." But in whose strength, and under whose guidance are they to do this? Let the inspired apostle answer this question. "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die: but if ye, THROUGH THE SPIRIT, do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live" (Rom. viii. 13). And this Holy Spirit does not bring into the soul a "spirit of bondage and fear," but is that "Spirit of adoption, whereby the children of God cry unto him, Abba, Father," in and through whom they have "peace and joy in believing," and are quickened and enabled "to live soberly, righteously, and godly, in this present world." It was this Spirit which commanded Peter (Acts x. 19), to accompany the messengers of Cornelius to Cæsarea; but not a few readers of the New Testament would find it difficult, or rather impossible to believe, without an express revelation, that it was this Spirit who inclined and guided Peter into that strange path of penance in which the legend assures us that he so long continued to walk.

We conclude this paper by placing side by side the words of Holy Writ, and those of the legend.

ACTS x. 9, 10.

"Peter went up upon the housetop to pray, about the sixth hour (noon): and he

LEGEND.

"Morning after morning, cock-crowing after cock-crowing, St. Peter wept his fall. Some lentile-broth, of the daily value of a farthing, was, for his whole life long, the penitential food

became very hungry, and *would have eaten* (ἤθελε γεύσασθαι), but *while they made ready*, he fell into a trance."

of him by whose hands God wrought special miracles, by whose shadow passing by he healed the sick; through whom he first admitted both Jews and Gentiles into the Church; to whom, first in dignity among the other apostles, he gave the keys of the kingdom of heaven."

And now we would earnestly and respectfully request Dr. Pusey to read attentively, and with humble prayer for divine teaching, morning after morning during one single week, the twenty-first chapter of St. John's Gospel, the tenth and eleventh chapters of the Acts of the Apostles, and the second chapter of the Epistle to the Galatians. If he should consent to do this, we might not unreasonably indulge the hope that before the close of the week he would sincerely and deeply regret having announced from the pulpit, in the character of a minister of Christ, and afterwards published from the press, as unquestionable truth, the childish legendary fable of which we have been speaking. And should he thus be led to see how thoroughly contradictory is this legend to the plain statements of the written word of God, it would surely be to his honour as a man, and as a minister of Christ, to confess and retract his error as publicly as he has avowed and supported it.

G.



CORRESPONDENCE.

. The Editor begs the reader will bear in mind that he does not hold himself responsible for the opinions of his Correspondents.

THE GOLDEN CALF.

SIR,—In a recent number of your Journal my little book upon Ancient Metallurgy was favourably noticed. In that work I endeavoured to shew that references made to metallurgical operations in Scripture, generally agree with the operations for effecting the same purpose in the present day. Connected with these metallurgical subjects is the demolition of the golden calf by Moses, which has long been termed the commentators' puzzle. Amongst several others who had ventured, or rather adopted, conjectures upon this puzzle, I made particular reference to the Rev. Dr. Eadie, who—apparently adopting an old conjecture that Moses fused the calf with sulphur and an alkali, and produced a grindable and potable compound—has represented Moses as mixing and fusing it with carbonate of soda, and considers the process a familiar operation.

Instead of following these impractical and absurd conjectures, or searching to find some process that could be applied without reference to the text, I consider Moses' plain and graphic statement, and shew that it exactly corresponds with what we, in our manufacturing operations, really do at the present day for effecting the same object—grinding metals to powder, and content myself with this, as being at all events a consistent and practical process. However, Dr. Eadie still thinks differently, and in his recent life of Dr. Kitto, I have been honoured with a special notice in reference to this matter, which I will now quote.

“Another recent author has taken up and rebuked both Dr. Kitto and ourselves upon a point on which he possesses practical skill and experience. The matter in dispute is the demolition of the golden calf by Moses. The conjecture may be untenable that Moses dissolved the calf in some chemical fluid, and mixed the nauseous potion with the water which he compelled the Israelites to drink, though certainly a solvent sufficient for the purpose might easily be fixed upon, and might be known to Egyptian chemistry. The words of Moses are, He burned it in the fire, and ground it to powder, and strewed it upon the waters, and stamped it, and ground it very small, even until it was as small as dust. Mr. Napier thus explains the process, ‘It was put into the fire that it might be cast into bars suitable for the operations which were to follow.’ Thus the modern chemist says it was melted, but Moses declares it was ‘burned’ in the fire; not melted certainly, for the different language plainly describes a different process. By stamping Mr. Napier understands beating it out into thin leaves, a refinement of operation which the words do not warrant; the text implies that the burning was not fusion, but some unknown process that prepared the metal for the stamping and grinding; a process which Mr. Napier, though he meditated a book on the chemistry of the Bible, has not discovered, but has been obliged to leave unexplained.”

That Dr. Eadie holds a high position in his own sphere of labour, and is an eminent authority in that field, no one can doubt, but on matters of practical science it is evident he is not sufficiently informed. The Dr. says that "the conjecture may be untenable that Moses dissolved the calf in some chemical fluid, though certainly a solvent sufficient for the purpose might easily be fixed upon, and might be known to Egyptian chemistry." This is true; the dissolving the calf in a chemical fluid is untenable, not for want of one being discovered, as solvents sufficient for the purpose are known, and we are now all but certain were also known to Egyptian chemistry, but the text will not admit of a dissolving process, however practical and well-known; the processes referred to in the text are mechanical, not chemical.

Metallic gold cannot be combined with another solid body in the fire without one of them being melted, and the whole of the compound formed by their combination being in a state of fusion afterwards, so that Dr. Eadie's critical examination of the original, strikes at the root, not only of his own, but all the conjectures of the same kind which have been made. It is to be regretted that the Dr. did not define what is really meant by the word "burn," which he so positively says cannot be applied to fusion.

The operation of burning may be defined as the combination of a body with oxygen when subjected to heat or fire; thus a piece of coal or wood put into a fire burns, and the compound formed between the oxygen and the body burned being a gas, the whole is dispelled; under these circumstances burning is identical with complete destruction. Certain metals, such as iron and copper, put into a fire also burn, but the compound formed between the metal and oxygen being solid, is a crust upon the surface of the metal which protects from further burning; by removing this crust, burning goes on to form another crust, and so on until the whole of such metals may be burned through time, and these metals are by this process as fully destroyed as is the coal or wood. Had the calf been made of such burnable metals, the word burn taken in this sense would have been applicable, as being within practical possibility, although the text as translated hardly allows this mode of destruction. When this definition of the word burn is applied to gold it is untenable. It is one of the distinguishing properties of gold to resist the fire, which means being incapable of burning; indeed when gold is combined with oxygen, and this oxide put into a fire, the metal is revived and the oxygen given off, and fire has ever been the practical means for purifying gold, as is evident from Scripture; so permanent and well-known is this law, that to burn gold by putting it into a fire would be as great a miracle as causing the head of an iron axe to swim above water; and we have no idea from the text that in Moses burning the calf he wrought a miracle, or wished the Israelites to believe so, but rather that he performed a well-known operation. May not the word *burn* have a more popular sense than that here given, and evidently meant by the Dr.'s remarks, as it appears to have in other passages in Scripture; *e.g.*, Deut. iv. 11, "And the mountain burned with fire," etc. And the term is popularly applied to making a body red-hot; however, the true rendering of the original and the mean-

ing evidently applied to the term burn, I leave to scholars, as an important inquiry.

The objection which the Dr. makes to hammering the gold into thin leaves previous to grinding, as being too refined, or rather that the language will not warrant so refined an operation, I only mention, because many of our most refined operations in metals were familiar to the ancient Egyptians, and consequently would be referred to incidentally in the most popular manner, as seems to be done in the text under review; as to the ability of the Egyptians to beat gold thin there can be no dispute.

As to the Dr.'s remarks upon my meditating a book on the chemistry of the Bible, while I had not discovered how Moses burned the calf, I would merely say that the demolition of the calf did not come within the sphere of chemistry, and I believe no chemist has been culpable of dragging it into that false position. I understood, and still believe, that the process was wholly mechanical, and it is astonishing how men professing a belief in the record, and yet wise beyond what is written, lay aside a plain description of a process done under the eyes, and by the direction of the writer of it, and say, "No, that is not what you did; you must have dissolved it in some chemical fluid you were told of in Egypt, or melted it with some such substances as sulphur and an alkali, or perhaps *natron* being plentiful in your country, you have melted it with this; you were not mechanical enough or sufficiently refined in your operations to do it in the way you have stated;" such is really the language that has been used in reference to this passage.

I would say in conclusion that I do not advocate any particular mode of demolishing the calf. All I wished to shew is the identity of the process described by Moses, as translated in the Authorized Version, to the practice of the present day, and that if we were called upon to perform the same task, we would adopt the same method as Moses describes. I would add that if commentators, however high they stand in theological science, would—when they fearlessly, often recklessly, venture into the field of practical science—adhere more closely to the text there would be fewer puzzles; or probably what would be a wiser course, if they would let all matters requiring the knowledge of practical science alone, if they have not personally studied them, Scripture truth would certainly gain and not lose.

I am, yours, etc.,

JAMES NAPIER.

DARIUS AND CYRUS THE GREAT.

To the Editor of "The Journal of Sacred Literature."

Claysmore, July 30th, 1857.

SIR,—Your correspondent G. B. in the *J. S. L.* of this month, p. 431, has touched upon a very interesting historical question connected with the time of the fall of Babylon and restoration of the Jews, viz., the

then political constitution of the Medo-Persian empire; concerning which the sacred historians lead us to conclusions so widely differing from what we collect from Herodotus. After stating his view of this question, in which I perfectly agree with him, he proceeds to draw what appears to him to be a conclusive argument against the idea, that Darius the son of Hytaspes was one and the same king with Darius the Median of the book of Daniel. As this identification of the supposed two kings is a fundamental position in my proposed arrangement of Scriptural chronology, and indeed follows as a necessary consequence of arranging the events spoken of by Herodotus in connexion with the eclipse of Thales around the year B.C. 585,^a instead of the year B.C. 610, as hitherto, I feel called upon to give the most careful consideration to an argument which is supposed to militate against a conclusion leading to so many important results.

Your correspondent refers to Dan. viii. 3, 4, where the prophet speaking in the third year of Belshazzar king of Babylon, being himself either in vision or in person at Shushan the palace, in the province of Elam, on the banks of the Ulai or Choaspes, says, "Then I lifted up mine eyes, and behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns, *and the two horns were high*, and one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last:" from which he infers, "that the two horns on the ram denote two contemporaneous sovereigns." Now, if we substitute the word kingdoms for "sovereigns,"—for the prophet speaks of nations, not of individuals—I think his inference is perfectly just, "that before the fall of Belshazzar (whenever that event may have happened) the two contemporaneous kingdoms of Media and Persia were associated together in an alliance and confederacy so intimate as to approximate very closely to a joint sovereignty." This I believe to have been the true state of the empire at the time in question: a political condition accurately described by Xenophon, but misrepresented by Herodotus, who considers that the power of the Medes was extinct after the fall of Astyages, and that from thenceforth the Persians under Cyrus and his successors ruled with absolute dominion over Asia.

Thus far then your correspondent and I are agreed. Nor do I doubt that the two kingdoms of Media and Persia were then ruled each by its own independent sovereign. But upon what ground is he justified in begging the whole question at issue between us, in the following abrupt conclusion? "If this inference," he says, "be correct, it would almost necessarily follow that before the siege and capture of Babylon, the Persian horn was higher than the Median, i. e., *that Cyrus was not only more illustrious and renowned, but that he was a more powerful king than Darius the Mede*. It would also certainly follow, from this view, that the Darius of Daniel was a Mede and not a Persian—and certainly that he was not Darius Hytaspes." What, let me ask, is the connexion here between premises and conclusion? How does all this almost necessarily follow from

^a On the 12th June last, the Astronomer Royal delivered a lecture at the Astronomical Society, in which he again pronounced, that there can be no question that the eclipse of 28th May, B.C. 585, is that predicted by Thales, and that which put an end to war between Lydia and Media.

the admission, that in the time of Belshazzar the two kingdoms of Media and Persia were associated together in intimate alliances and confederacy? Two very questionable assumptions are involved in this most hasty conclusion.

1. That Cyrus (Coresh the grandson of Astyages) was a powerful king when Belshazzar was slain.

2. That Darius the Mede immediately succeeded to the throne of Babylon on the death of Belshazzar.

In the first place, it is a question very difficult to decide when Belshazzar was slain, considering that this king is nowhere mentioned in profane history. Hales is disposed to identify him with Neriglissar of the Canon. Scaliger and Sir. I. Newton argue in favour of his identity with Laborosoarchod. Josephus and others think that he was Nabonadius, who was deposed, *though not slain*, by Cyrus, and ceased to reign seventeen years later than the last named king. It might also be argued, if Belshazzar was really succeeded by Darius, that he was merely a vassal of Darius Hytaspes set as ruler over Babylon, and he who caused by his revolt that siege of Babylon which Herodotus describes as lasting twenty months. I am not disposed, however, to dispute the fact that Cyrus the grandson of Astyages took possession of Babylon on the night of that great feast which was given by Belshazzar. All history sacred and profane concurs in leading us to that conclusion. The question before us is, was the grandson of Astyages who took Babylon, then a powerful king on the throne of Persia?

Now it is true that Herodotus, in the full belief that he was relating the most probable out of three or four different histories which he had heard concerning Cyrus, has told us, that on the fall of Astyages his grandson Cyrus became sole and absolute monarch over all Asia, and that the empire was Persian when Babylon fell. A position by the way, inconsistent with Daniel's symbol of the ram with *two high horns*, and also with his denunciation that the kingdom of Belshazzar should be given to the *Medes* and Persians. But because Herodotus has so judged, is that sufficient ground for the assertion that Cyrus almost necessarily was then a powerful king? Does your correspondent consider himself at liberty to set at nought the direct assertion of Ctesias to the contrary, who tells us, on the authority of the Persian records, that Herodotus was mistaken as to the identity of the Persian conqueror who deposed Astyages, whom he declares to have been a stranger in blood to the Median king, and, though bearing the title Cyrus, to have been born of an earlier generation than the grandson of Astyages, having himself married the daughter of that king? Is it reasonable or philosophical to reject such testimony without a cause, considering how highly the testimony of Ctesias is estimated in later periods of Persian history? Does he also consider himself at liberty to set at nought the corroborative assertion of Xenophon in his *Cyropædia*, that Cyrus, grandson of Astyages, conquered Babylon while his father Cambyses and his uncle Cyaxares were reigning, one in Persia, the other in Media: and also that Cyrus, not yet a king, was on terms of amity with his grandfather, and in alliance with, not in hostility with the Medes?

It has been observed, indeed, and if the testimony of Ctesias is set aside, the observation would be just, that Xenophon, in his *Anabasis*, has virtually contradicted what he has thus stated in his *Cyropædia*, concerning the amity between Media and Persia during the latter years of Astyages, inasmuch as he has recorded the important fact,—worth indeed many opinions,—that the city Larissa (Nimrûd), which had belonged to the Medes, was taken by the Persians during a solar eclipse, about the time when the Persians overcame the Medes. But here is no just ground for charging Xenophon with contradiction. He thus conforms in the *Anabasis* the statement of Herodotus and Ctesias, which on the joint testimony of the three must be received as fact, that the Medes were reduced by force of arms into subjection to the Persians, in the reign of Astyages as the date implies. Nevertheless in the *Cyropædia* he confirms the further statement of Ctesias, contradicting Herodotus, that immediately after the conquest of Astyages, a family alliance was formed, which bound together in amity the two great nations—the two high horns—of Media and Persia. For Ctesias relates how Astyages was immediately released by Cyrus after his defeat, and how he treated him rather with the honours of a father than as a captive, and how after tendering to Amytis the daughter of Astyages the respect due to a mother, he afterwards married that princess, upon which the Bactrians, and probably the other tributary provinces, submitted to him as son of their Median sovereign. Soon after this, *i. e.*, after the revolted provinces had been subdued, I take to be the commencement of the federacy of Media and Persia, when all the tributary provinces of the empire became subject to the laws of the Medes and Persians. Mr. Airy has lately shewn from Hansen's new and most refined lunar and solar tables, that the eclipse here referred to took place in the year B.C. 557, a date which well accords with the historical date of the conquest of Astyages, B.C. 559. The conquest of Astyages by Cyrus is thus fixed beyond dispute at a time long preceding the capture of Babylon by the grandson of Astyages, which no one would place earlier than B.C. 538; and accepting the testimony of Xenophon,—so well informed in other respects concerning the events connected with the capture of Babylon,—who declares that the grandson of Astyages came to the throne after the fall of that city, it necessarily follows that the Cyrus who defeated Astyages, as Ctesias affirms, was a different person from Cyrus the grandson of that king. Seeing then that Ctesias and Xenophon both agree to set aside the testimony of Herodotus, concerning the accession of Cyrus, I feel that I am justified in concluding, that there is no sufficient evidence for believing that the grandson of Astyages was on the throne of Persia when Babylon was taken; but on the contrary, that the evidence preponderates against such an assumption.

Let us now consider the foundation for your correspondent's second assumption, that Darius the Median immediately succeeded to the throne of Babylon on the death of Belshazzar.

How does he arrive at this conclusion, so vital to his argument? Certainly not from the book of Daniel. It is true that the English version of Daniel leads to the idea, that on the night when Belshazzar was slain, Darius became possessed of his kingdom. But if he will examine any

Hebrew Bible, for instance Walton's, Lee's, or Stier and Theile's Polyglots, or Jahn's *Biblia Hebraica*, he will find that the words, "In that night was Belshazzar king of the Chaldæans slain," form the ending of one of Daniel's writings, and that the words, "And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about three-score and two years old," form the opening of another chapter or treatise. Your correspondent writes to the same effect in the *J. S. L.* of April last, p. 171. "We cannot," he says, "without offering something like violence to the obvious tenor of the scriptural narrative, suppose that Darius the Mede did not at once receive the kingdom which had belonged to Belshazzar." But how contrary to all evidence is such an assertion. The original copies of Daniel separate instead of joining the above two sentences. The violence therefore lies with those who join them, not with those who put them asunder. Sir John Marsham has long ago observed, that by the same process we might prove that Belshazzar succeeded Cyrus on the throne, because chap. vi. ends with the words, "In the reign of Cyrus the Persian," and chap. vii. begins with the words, "In the first year of Belshazzar." Nor can your correspondent find support for his assumption from any secular authority prior to Josephus, who was as much perplexed as we are in endeavouring to arrange this period of Jewish history. There is neither brick, nor monument, nor writing of any sort before Josephus which can lead to the idea of a Darius having reigned in Babylon so early as the death of Belshazzar is usually placed.

After careful consideration, therefore, of this matter, it appears that at the time of the fall of Belshazzar, there is neither sufficient evidence for believing that Cyrus was then on the throne, nor for believing that Darius the Median then began to reign over Babylon. From these two baseless propositions, therefore, no solid argument can be raised against the identity of Darius the Mede, and Darius the son of Hystaspes.

On the other hand, Daniel has marked with extreme precision, if we can interpret his words, the year of the accession of Darius to the throne of Babylon, by stating,

1st. That it was when the 70 years' desolation of Jerusalem, counted from the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, was approaching its termination; which desolation I would now place in the year B.C. 562, being the nineteenth from the association of Nebuchadnezzar on the throne with his father, in B.C. 580, five years after the eclipse of B.C. 585.

2. That Darius was then about 62 years of age, which was about the age of the only Darius known in history at that period, in B.C. 493.

3. Speaking prophetically, that I would prove to be seventy weeks of years, or 490 years before the coming of Messiah.

I am, Sir, yours very truly,

J. W. BOSANQUET.

THE IMAGE OF GOD.

SIR,—In the fifth number of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, in an article entitled “The Ancient Expectation of a Redeemer,” is the following sentence:—“The assertion in the beginning of Genesis that man was created in the image of God, may, for any reason that appears to the contrary, be understood quite literally, and may have been intended to convey what is certainly its most obvious meaning.”

These are startling words, and must be felt to be such by those who strictly adopt the usual interpretation of Gen. i. 26, by Jewish as well as Christian writers, that the image and likeness of God, in which man is said to be created, refers to his intellectual and spiritual part only, and moreover to the dominion and sovereignty conferred upon him over the lower order of beings in creation. In other words, “Let us form a creature endowed with a rational mind and an immortal soul, with all those intellectual and moral qualities which should accompany such a gift.” There can be no doubt that Adam was so endowed; but does the text bear a more literal interpretation? “Let us make man *בְּצַלְמֵנוּ*; Sept., *κατ’ εἰκόνα ἡμετέραν καὶ καθ’ ὁμοίωσιν*; Vulg., “ad imaginem et similitudinem nostram.” The question remains to be answered, Is there any text in the Old Testament in which words similar to the above clearly only shew a “moral” resemblance to the Supreme Being? Of course it would imply an extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures to answer this question satisfactorily; but the evidence would rather seem to bear out the idea that such a similarity would not easily be discovered in the sacred text. We read in Gen. v. 3, “And Adam lived an hundred and thirty years, and begat a son (*בְּצַלְמוֹ*) in his own likeness, after his image.” Here are the same two words (only reversed in order) as are used to express the creation of man by God. It would scarcely, however, be a fitting interpretation to say that Adam begat a son endowed with reason like himself, but without any reference to specific bodily figure. But still more to the point: when Moses lays down the penal law of homicide, he bases it on the fact that man was moulded in the image of his Maker: “Whoso sheddeth man’s blood, by man shall his blood be shed; for in the image of God (*בְּצַלְמֵי אֱלֹהִים*) made he man.” But since, in the case of murder, it is the “body,” and not the soul, which suffers the wrong, it would hardly have been consistent to assign, as the reason for a retaliation of punishment, that man was made in the image of God, except “that image” had, in some incomprehensible manner, included the body as well as the soul. And since we are perfectly sure that many persons undergo a violent death, who, so far from bearing the image of God “in a moral sense,” are utterly alien to him in thought, word, and deed, it would be very illogical to say of such persons that their murder must be avenged with blood, because they were made like our prototype, “in the image of God.” St. Paul also seems to understand a certain conformity in bodily figure to the Almighty, when he says (1 Cor. xi. 7), “For a man ought not to cover his head, forasmuch as he is the *image* and glory of

God" (εἰκὼν καὶ δόξα Θεοῦ ὑπάρχων). It may be remarked that the first of these words is that used in the Septuagint Version in Gen. i. 26.

It appears, then, that we can hardly escape from the conclusion that in the first of these texts we must understand some bodily figure which belonged adventitiously, but not essentially, to the Supreme Being. I may here quote the language of a writer of considerable acuteness, but whose work is perhaps little known at present :^a—

“ Before the creation of the world, and, consequently, anterior to the formation of man, it was divinely decreed, not only to create, but to redeem, human nature from the penalties of sin and transgression by the second subsistency of the Godhead uniting in his own person the whole nature of man—the body as well as the soul—and by his continuing to subsist eternally in that personal compound of Godhead and manhood as the Author of a new and everlasting covenant, and as the divine Mediator and Intercessor between man and his Maker. By virtue of this antemundane decree and determinate counsel of God, the image of man has a right to be called the image of God; not only because at the close of the Mosaic dispensation the Word or Metatron, according to the belief of the Christian Church, was to assume the human figure, never more to be deposited; but because, according to the statements of most Jewish and Christian fathers, this illustrious personage did actually appear in that shape and figure in the first dispensations of the world, as well to the primæval parents themselves as to the patriarchs and prophets who flourished long after them.”

No one, I imagine, who has read the chapter on the Deity of the Messiah in Hengstenberg's *Christology*, can doubt that the second person in the Blessed Trinity did actually appear in human “form,” though not in human “nature,” to the patriarchs and prophets. But I think we are warranted, from Gen. iii. 8, in concluding that the same divine person appeared to our first parents, though the Authorized Version is not free from ambiguity: “And they heard *the voice* (הַקוֹל) of the Lord God walking in the garden, in the cool of the day.” Rosenmüller, in his *Scholia*, observes, “Nomen (הַקוֹל) ambiguum est, vocem enim loquentis, et strepitum quemvis significat,—videtur hic designari strepitus nescio quis Dei adventantis prænuntius, cujus meminit alibi Scriptura.” There can be little doubt that our version rather appears to imply, in conformity with this interpretation, that it was the “voice of the Lord God which was uttered or sent forth, walking, as it were, in the cool of the day.” But the grammatical construction seems to require a more literal interpretation, namely, the agreement of הַקוֹל with הַיְיָ, in accordance with the Septuagint, τῆς φωνῆς κυρίου τοῦ Θεοῦ περιπατοῦντος, and the Vulgate, “vocem Domini Dei deambulantis.” But this interpretation is not only strengthened, but confirmed, by the words, “Adam and his wife hid themselves *from the presence* (הַפְּנֵי) of the Lord God among the trees of the garden.” That they “hid themselves from a voice” is hardly probable. They who had lost their primæval innocence, and knew that they had sinned, naturally fled from the awful presence of their Creator and Benefactor.

How enhanced, then, is the dignity of man's nature, and how wonderful the thought that the second person in the Blessed Trinity, who saw

^a *The Christian Doctrines of the Trinity and Incarnation considered and maintained on the Principles of Judaism.* By Rev. John Oxlee. 1815.

the first sin in "human form," atoned for sin in his "human nature." Truly may we say, in the words of the Psalmist, "What is man that thou art mindful of him, and the son of man that thou visitest him."

Cheltenham, Sept. 7th, 1857.

H. P.

XENOPHON AND CYRUS THE GREAT.

To the Editor of "The Journal of Sacred Literature."

SIR,—In the July number of *The Journal of Sacred Literature*, p. 438, I quoted as correct, a remark from the *Life of Cyrus*, in Dr. Smith's *Biographical Dictionary*, viz., that the account which Herodotus gives of the transference of the Median empire to the Persians, is in substance confirmed even by Xenophon himself, when speaking, in the *Anabasis*, of the two cities Larissa and Mespila.

The learned writer of that life will, perhaps, think that Xenophon may possibly have then spoken of Darius Hystaspes rather than of Cyrus, when he reads the following extract from Dr. Brandis on the *Assyrian Inscriptions*:^a "From the inscription of Behistun, rich in facts and names of the first years of Darius (Hystaspes), it appears that a brief notice in Herodotus of an insurrection of the Medes against Darius, which had been supposed to refer to a rebellion under Darius Nothus, or even to be interpolated, relates to an insurrection headed by a native Mede named Phraortes."

Still it remains unquestioned that the historian Ctesias, with much better opportunities than Xenophon^b for ascertaining the truth, asserts that Cyrus invaded Media and forcibly dethroned Astyages. Thus Herodotus and Ctesias agree with the obvious interpretation of Daniel's vision of the ram and he-goat, that the higher or Persian horn arose to pre-eminence and superiority before the Medo-Persian conquest of Babylon. Professor Airy and Mr. Adams are bound to make out a very clear case indeed in favour of the eclipse of 385 B.C., if we are to surrender what may be considered as the united testimony of Daniel, Herodotus, and Ctesias to astronomical calculations in which there is still found some degree of conjecture and uncertainty. -

Herodotus certainly seems to teach us that the Scythians were not expelled until after the close of the Lydo-Median war. If, then, the true duration of the Scythian dominion be twenty-two years,^c Psammiticus must have been alive as late as 607 B.C. on the supposition that the eclipse of 585 was that of Thales. Dr. Hincks is of opinion that 612 B.C. is the latest assignable date of the death of Psammiticus.

^a *J. S. L.*, July, p. 346.

^b We may neither neglect, nor press too far, Cicero's important remark, that Xenophon's object in the *Cyropædia* was not so much historical accuracy, as to give a pattern of good government.

^c *J. S. L.*, January, p. 463.

So far as the grammatical construction is concerned, the *participial* form, וְהָיוּ עֹמְדִים (Dan. xi. 2) may be rendered, "are yet or still standing up," but not so as to mean, "two have already stood up, and the third is yet standing up." The choice seems to be between two versions, "are (all three) yet standing up," or "are yet successively to stand up, shall yet stand up;" if so, Theodotion's *ἀναστήσονται* must be accepted.

July 9th.

G. B.

AHASUERUS AND ARTAXERXES.

SIR,—It has been asserted that we ought not to think of identifying the Cambyses and Magian Smerdis of secular history with the Ahasuerus (iv. 6), and Artaxerxes (iv. 11) of Ezra.

I was lately reading a life of Alexander the Great,^d in which is the following statement concerning the conduct of Bessus after the death of Darius :—"Many Persians came over to Alexander, while remaining at Susa, and informed him that Bessus had assumed the distinctions peculiar to the King of kings, the upright tiara, the robe with the intermingled red, white, and purple stripes, and the royal name of *Artaxerxes*," p. 187.

Aug. 28th, 1857.

G. B.

^d *The Life of Alexander the Great*, by the Rev. John Williams, Rector of the Edinburgh Academy. Murray: 1829. Second Edition.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

Essays on the Accordance of Christianity with the Nature of Man. By EDWARD FRY. Edinburgh: Constable and Co., 1857. 12mo. pp. 216.

"You complain of those persons," wrote Dr. Arnold to one of his friends, "who judge of a revelation not by its evidence, but by its substance. It has always seemed to me that its substance is a most essential part of its evidence, and that miracles wrought in favour of what was foolish or wicked would only prove Manicheism. We are so perfectly ignorant of the unseen world, that the character of any supernatural power can be judged of only by the moral character of the statements which it sanctions; thus only can we tell whether it be a revelation from God or from the devil. If his father tell a child something which seems to him monstrous, faith requires him to submit his own judgment, because he knows his father's person, and is therefore sure that his father tells it him. But we cannot thus know God; and can only recognize his voice by the words spoken being in agreement with our idea of his moral nature."^a

These words state very clearly, and in the main very fairly, the great question between the external and internal evidences of Christianity. The question is, indeed, nearly as old as Christianity itself, but it is one of those phenomena of the inner life of the Church, the true meaning and development of which will perhaps never be fully understood till the history of the Christian dispensation shall come to be read by the light of that great and awful struggle to which prophecy seems to point as its close. Some few broad facts may, however, even now be discerned standing out in bold relief through the mists of the eighteen centuries.

In the minds of the first converts to Christianity, it is evident that the surpassing glory of the life of Jesus, and the mighty wonders and signs whereby his mission was attested, wrought together with the deep longings of their own hearts for healing and rest such as he held out to them, to produce a simple childlike faith, not so ready to reason or to analyze as lovingly to give up all and suffer all for his name.

But this phase of the Christian life, so joyous, so true, so fruitful in good works, could hardly last through the whole life-time either of the Church or of its individual members. Even if the heart loses none of the fervour of its first love, contact with "them that are without" forces upon it the necessity of a somewhat more self-conscious faith. It was a heathen sophist, in the darkening days even of heathenism, who said, "The things of the gods, if knowable by men, are

^a *Arnold's Life*, ii., 229.

incommunicable." The Christian apostle wrote, "Be ye ready to give to every man *a reason* of the hope that is in you, with meekness and fear;" and the duty of thus proving to reason the reasonableness of submitting itself to faith, to say nothing of the necessity of explaining to the children of believers why and in whom their parents trusted, must already, before the close of the apostolic age, have compelled the construction of something like a philosophy of the Christian faith. And this process once commenced, we may be sure that it would not be long before two different tendencies would reveal themselves in the minds of those who were thus engaged. One class of teachers would be found most frequently insisting on the prophecies which, ages before the birth of our Lord, heralded his coming; on the mighty works which, during his personal presence on earth, attested his dominion over nature; on the miraculous gifts of tongues, of healing, of exorcism, which still distinguished from all other men those who believed on his name. The other class, while not only not denying these glorious facts in the *external* history of their religion, but cherishing them as dearer than life, and often falling back upon them for the stay and sustenance of their fainting faith, would yet, from the natural constitution of their minds, be far more inclined to dwell on its *internal evidence*, on that inward witness which their own heart and the heart of their hearers afforded, that the Gospel of Christ was indeed glad tidings, sent by the Creator of the universe to the highest but unhappiest of his earthly creatures.

Are we mistaken in thinking that even St. Paul was in the course of his inspired teaching led more often upon this track than upon the other? How little allusion do we find in his epistles to that great outward marvel by which his own conversion had been wrought! How emphatically he speaks of the miraculous gifts as "a sign to them which believe not!" As if, under the prescience that there should come an age of the Church when all these attesting marvels should have vanished away, and when the voices which told of the miraculous facts of Christianity should seem to grow faint and indistinct by reason of distance, how eagerly he turns to those other facts discoverable in each human heart, which, so long as a race like ours remains upon the earth,—a race of beings, suffering, tempted, falling, yet longing to rise,—shall never wax old or vanish away. Why is it that he insists so often and so strongly on the "law written in the hearts of men," on the strife of flesh against spirit and of spirit against flesh, on the will that there is in us to do good, evil being yet present with us, on the bondage under which the whole creation is groaning even until now, and on that other more terrible bondage under which the spirit of man has often groaned for a whole lifetime,—the fear of death? Why, but because all these undoubted facts of our consciousness furnish each individual man with an attestation of the truth of God; because the law speaks to him of a lawgiver, the strife of the Captain of our salvation, the discords around us of a future, and in part of a present but deeper harmony—the bondage, of a deliverer,—the fear of death,

of that life and immortality which he has brought to light in his Gospel?

Thus in the very earliest ages of the Church may be supposed to have been drawn that line of demarcation between the two great classes of argument on behalf of Christianity, which we notice so continually in our own day. It seems probable enough that that which is drawn from the *internal* evidence was chiefly favoured by the keen metaphysical intellects of the Greeks and Orientals, while the strong practical bias of the Roman mind, ever liable to be swayed downwards to materialism, led it rather to prefer the *external* or historical proofs of Christianity. Tertullian, indeed, in many of his apologetic writings, especially in those in which he expands and elaborates his beautiful utterance, "*Testimonium animæ naturaliter Christianæ*," affords one proof that the subjective evidence for our religion was not lost on the Western intellect: Minucius Felix, in his most delightful little dialogue, the *Octavius*, furnishes us with another. But upon the whole we shall probably not be far wrong in looking upon *Alexandria* as the chosen home of this species of Christian teaching during the early ages of the Church, and on that class of teachers to whom apparently Apollos belonged in the first century, and Origen in the second, as the chief defenders and illustrators of it.

Indeed the Alexandrian mind had already received a certain impetus in this direction before Christianity was preached at all. Placed as the capital of the Ptolemies was, at the confluence of the two great streams of civilization, the Oriental and the Hellenic, with its myriads of Jewish inhabitants speaking the Greek tongue, learning to clothe their thoughts in somewhat of a Grecian garb, and, above all, reading the sacred books of their fathers in a Greek version,—it was inevitable but that some of its citizens should ask themselves what relation this strange old-world creed,—so unlike in its pure monotheism either to the degraded animal worship of the Egyptians or to the sensuous art-worship of the Greeks,—bore to the various philosophies which included all the real faith of every thinking man in either nation. And thus the two greatest facts of the old dispensation, God's voice to man and man's groping after God, the Old Testament and Greek philosophy, were brought face to face with one another in the city of the Lagidæ: and thus it was that so many of the lines of the position taken up by Origen in the second century had been already traced out by Philo in the first.

So fared it with the Church in its earliest ages. It is not now our business to rehearse any part of the dreary history of its apparent victory over heathenism. It is not for us to tell how, when it deemed the strife ended, its real and deadliest strife began; how the hero found that he had donned unawares the vestments of his dead foe, and knew not, till he essayed to rend them from him, how deeply their poison had entered into his vitals, nor how sharp and sore and terrible would be the struggle of his disarraying.

Suffice it to remark how, even in their degeneracy, the two great

types of human thought on things divine still retained their distinctness. The Christian philosophy of the earliest ages of the Eastern Church passed into the elaborately subtle speculations which formed the ground-work of such controversies as that between the Homoousians and Homoiovsians. "Vainly puffed up by the fleshly mind and intruding into things not seen," the Greek, while daily deviating more widely from the path of righteousness and truth, while the life of Christ was daily exercising less and less influence upon *his* life, was yet day by day striving to throw the little plummet of his intellect deeper into the unfathomed mysteries of the nature of God, as revealed in Christ Jesus. And so it came to pass that while Christian disputation flourished, Christianity withered away; and when the Arabian conquerors issued from their deserts, strong at least in some recollections of the one pure and holy God, the God of Abraham and of Moses, the friend of righteousness, the abhorrer of all idolatry and sin, that idle and babbling creed, dead to good works, alive only in the wrangling disputations of ambitious ecclesiastics, fell before the Mohammedan sword, impotent and defenceless.

The Roman, meanwhile, true even in the prostration of his nation to his old, world-conquering instincts, still haunted by the remembrance of the words, "Tu regere imperio populos Romane memento," went triumphantly on, in his career of external dominion. Church after church of the barbarians fell before his legates, as province after province had been wont to fall before his proconsuls. But in everything which he did there was the same impress of *externality*, of love for material demonstration. The miracles of the New Testament, indeed, seemed to be growing dim in the distant centuries; and the book itself contained too many germs of thought hostile to priestly ascendancy for the newly converted nations to be boldly invited to come and study in it the external evidences of Christianity. Even had the Church been willing so to invite, few in those illiterate ages would have been able to accept the invitation. Yet some *sign* seemed needful to establish the truth of the religion; without some tangible evidence that her commission came from above, how could the barbarian be expected once more to submit himself to the authority of Rome? The long train of alleged miracles, the relic-worship, the canonizations, the pilgrimages, with which we are so familiar in the history of the Middle Ages, were the expedients resorted to. The little nucleus of reality which all these contained was the undoubted verity that man may ask from those who profess to be the messengers of God some sign that he has given them a right to speak in his name. Spiritual ambition, the monopoly of the intellectual culture of the world, and the ever-recurring delusion that it is possible for the God of truth to be served acceptably by falsehood—from these causes and such as these grew the enormous husk of deceit in which that little truth was buried.

The intellectual monopoly of the Church was, as we all know, invaded by the schoolmen and destroyed by the reformers. We doubt whether either class possesses for our present purpose an importance at

all proportionate to their place in the general intellectual history of Europe. The former frequently brushed, as it were, close by the edge of some of the greatest questions, both of the external and internal evidences of Christianity. But we imagine that formally to have discussed the quantity and the importance of either would have been a breach of that tacit compact between them and the Church by which their confession of her absolute authority on all matters theological was made the purchase-money for the fullest license of thought on all other subjects, and for permission to range over all the rest of the intellectual universe, applying to all things knowable and unknowable the foot-rule of the Aristotelian logic, and cramming all into the pigeon-holes of the Aristotelian categories.

So too with the reformers, though for a nobler reason, enquiries of this sort appear to have held but an inconspicuous place. We do not see how any impartial student of the history of the Church can deny that a measure of the faith of the earliest converts to Christianity was, at the time of the reformation, poured largely forth upon many hearts in the nations of Western Europe, to prepare them for their part in that great crisis. Before that new burst of faith, the reviving heathenism of Italy—cultured, elegant, artistic, and utterly *dilettante*—shrank back, as in their old struggle twelve centuries before, powerless and disheartened. Even in the Roman Catholic camp the spirit of Leo X. was driven out by the spirit of Loyola; and, for a space, the Christian revelation was by all classes, and by all sects in Christendom, accepted as the one greatest fact in man's history; the Christian faith as the one possession, for the sake of which, full and pure, every other possession might cheaply be sacrificed. Of the reaction of the secret heathenism of the human heart against this almost universal belief we ourselves know too much to render it needful minutely to describe its phases and its symptoms. For the same unbelief which darkened the close of the seventeenth century, and which hung as a thick and almost impenetrable cloud over the eighteenth, is, as we all feel, not wholly dispelled from over the nineteenth. Now it was precisely in this condition of things—Paganism becoming again active, self-conscious, and uneasy under the yoke of Christianity—that the old battle of the evidences was, and might naturally have been expected to be, renewed, with those keener weapons which sixteen centuries more of acquaintance with the world, with history, and with the human heart, had placed in the hands of either set of combatants.

With that series of scholars who have set forth and systematized the *external* evidences, we have no present concern. For the *internal* we will briefly touch on two great names—one French, the other English—Pascal and Butler. In each of these may be traced the influence of the master mind, which had given its form and direction to the *philosophy* of either country respectively.

Pascal is emphatically the Descartes of Christian apologetics. Like Descartes, he seeks in the individual consciousness some sure resting-place for a mind wearied with tossing on the endless sea of

doubt: like him he meets the sceptic, not with hard unsympathizing dogmatism, but with a ready comprehension of his difficulties, and a willingness even to doubt with him for a time (*le doute provisoire*) if only the doubt be earnest and sincere, and the doubter truly willing to submit his whole heart, and soul, and mind, to the truth which shall at last dawn upon him at the end of his long gropings through the caverns of unbelief. Like Descartes, therefore, Pascal pursues (in his *Pensées*) a method which is essentially *à priori*. From *cogito, ergo sum*, the former professes to reconstruct the whole scheme of human knowledge abandoned to an hypothetical destruction during his earlier researches after truth. From the possibility that some voice may have once issued to man from his Maker, joined to the fact that in all ages he has longed to hear such a voice, the latter educes all that has yet been revealed to us of God's plan for our redemption through Christ Jesus. On the one rock which he finds to stand immoveable through all his doubt he rears again the whole temple of our faith, both the long vestibule of the Old Testament, and the sacrificial Holy of Holies of the New.

The method pursued by our own great apologist *Butler* is emphatically contrasted with this. Whether he possessed an intimate acquaintance with the writings of Bacon we know not, but, from whatever cause, he is thoroughly imbued with his spirit. "*Homo naturæ minister et interpres*," "*Naturam interrogare debemus*," and many other Baconian mottoes of the like tendency, might fitly be inscribed on the title-page of his *Analogy*. Both in it, and in his *Sermons on Human Nature*, the whole genius of the argument is *à posteriori*, not to deduce from individual consciousness; or, as he would say, "from our own notions of things," proofs either of the existence of a God, or of the truth of the Christian revelation, but to enquire how far the admitted facts of the world around us, and the admitted phenomena of human nature, appear to harmonize with the conclusions at which our race, as a whole, is alleged to have arrived concerning God, or the information which the chosen nation and the chosen Church profess to have received concerning his ways. One point of resemblance, indeed, there is between him and Pascal—the clear and strong sense which both have of the *limitations* of the human intellect; but this perhaps is no more than to say that both alike possess that true philosophical instinct without which no man has ever made for himself a really great and lasting name in the history of the architectonic science. But in almost all other respects the philosophical tendencies of the two minds appear to us to be strongly contrasted, though we doubt not either would have acknowledged the value and importance of the method used by the other.

In the interval, now more than a century, which has elapsed since Butler gave his great work to the world, it is to be regretted that in the line of enquiry opened up thereby he should have had so few followers. That line is one for which the English mind, by its fairness, by its soberness, by the habits of impartial enquiry and of self-control

which our institutions, both judicial and legislative, tend to foster—let us add, too, by the fear of God and the high value for Christianity which, with all our faults, are at the basis of the national character—is pre-eminently fitted. However appearances may be against us, we are not really as a nation wholly buried in material pursuits; there are yet thousands of English homes to which a blow dealt successfully at our Christian faith would carry more sorrow than any decay of trade or loss of empire. Yet for the thousands of keen and subtle English intellects which have devoted themselves with untiring industry to the investigation of the *physical* sciences, how many are there who have set themselves to scrutinize in the spirit of Butler the facts of our *moral* nature, and ask them what light they can throw on the mighty questions: “Whence come we? Whither go we? Who made us? What is His will concerning us?” We fear that but a short shelf would be needed for all the works of the English authors who have worthily philosophised on these themes within the last century.

For this reason we hail with especial satisfaction the little work before us,—*Essays on the accordance of Christianity with the Nature of Man*, by E. Fry. It does indeed belong to the class of “Small Books on Great Subjects.” There would be something preposterous in the idea of so mighty a theme—one the whole length and breadth of which we shall perhaps never fully comprehend either in this life or the next—being treated of within no greater compass than that of many a modern pamphlet, did the author advance even an implied pretension to have adopted an *exhaustive* method in his enquiries. But this he most emphatically disclaims: he speaks of them but as fragmentary contributions to our knowledge of a vast subject: he perhaps even under-rates the amount of completeness which a studious and thoughtful reader would admit them to possess.

But we will let him state his object in his own words:—

“If Christianity be a message from God, it is also a message to man; and if it must become the character of him who sent it, we are sure also that it must be fitted to the nature of him to whom it is sent. Now, though we be ignorant of God’s nature, and of the nature of things, yet we are not entirely ignorant of our own natures, but may, by means of consciousness and reflection on ourselves, gain no inconsiderable knowledge of them: so that here we have scope for an enquiry into the internal evidences of Christianity.

“Now this is the field in which the following essays have been made. Taking human nature on the one hand and Christianity on the other, I have endeavoured, in some few particulars, to enquire how far these are consonant to one another; but I have endeavoured everywhere to avoid enquiries into how far Christianity is adapted to what we may conceive of the Divine Being, or of the nature of things. . . .

“It will be seen that the question which I have been endeavouring to enquire into in these essays, is a very simple one, being but this: whether that religion which professes to be a message from God to man about his moral condition, does speak of it or assume it as in fact it is; whether the remedies, which profess to come from a divine physician, have anything to do with our state of disease,—whether that which professes to be a restoration of our fallen nature does fit on to those old and almost buried foundations of the primeval edifice, which we may still find by excavating deep into our reflection and consciousness. But here my enquiry ends; and I have nothing to do with those other questions which may be raised as to

whether the message is such as befits the sender as well as the recipient,—whether the medicine is such as we should expect from the physician as well as what suits the patient,—whether the means adopted for restoring our nature are such as we should expect from a divine architect; and until I know much more of the divine nature than I now do, I shall endeavour to avoid exercising my reason upon them. . . .

“It may perhaps be said, that if the argument of the following essays be true, then Christianity seems to be little more than a scheme adapted to man’s moral nature, a correlative made to fit the original; and that this nature being ascertainable by reflection, Christianity may be a product of mere human thought, like one of the schemes of Grecian wisdom, and so have required no revelation at all. To this we may answer, not only that such a supposition is highly improbable as to a religion coming from a people like the Jews, amongst whom moral and philosophical science had scarcely any place, and who did not, like the Greeks, dive down into their own natures; but also that the view of Christianity, on which such an objection could be founded, would be most partial and incomplete; for that, whilst Christianity is thus fitted to our nature, it also rises infinitely above it, and could never as a whole have been deduced from it,—that, in a word, there is in it enough that we can understand and feel to be germane to us, to make us believe and know that it is a message to us,—sufficient that is superhuman and mysterious to make us reverently accept it as a message from a Divine Being whose nature and attributes must ever be unfathomable and mysterious to us. It seems to me, that in the Christian system all the processes are superhuman, but that the subject-matter of them is everywhere that moral man of which we are conscious,—which I cannot but think is what might be reasonably expected, if God should concern himself with the restoration or melioration of man, and if for this end a relation were set up between the two natures, the divine and the human,—the one infinite, the other finite,—the one unknown, the other known. . . .

“Finally, I must beg my reader to recollect, that it is no part of my object to present any complete picture or even outline of Christianity, for I have only been concerning myself with very small parts, and often presenting incomplete and inadequate views of its doctrines, because I have had to do only with such parts of them as seem to have a manifest relation to our nature. I have not been speaking of the glorious things which may be said of the city of God, but only endeavouring to dig amongst its foundations, and to see whether it is in fact built into our human nature, and whether I can discover any traces of a former edifice of which the present is a rebuilding and restoration.”—pp. 8—17.

These passages, while revealing to all students of Butler upon what master our author has modelled his style, and from whom the hint of his investigation has been taken, will nevertheless shew also the complete independence of the two branches of enquiry, both of them dealing, however, entirely with the *internal* evidences for our religion.

The well-known argument of Butler is of this nature. It is assumed that man has an author: it is assumed that the present circumstances and constitution of the world proceed from, or are permitted by, that Divine Being. Religion, whether natural or revealed, professes to tell us something more about him, something concerning his nature, his government of us, the means whereby we may be reconciled to him, his future judgment, and the like. This, then, which we may, for the purpose of illustration, imagine to be a line drawn, or professing to be drawn, from God to his creatures, is, on account of certain apparent irregularities in its course, doubted, objected to, and the fact of its proceeding from its alleged source denied. Butler answers by pointing to that other admitted line from God to man, viz., the present

circumstances and constitution of the world, and by shewing that similar irregularities and deviations exist therein. The whole argument, therefore, is *destructive of an objection*. In its direct and primary application it has no constructive efficacy. And, further, not the nature of God, nor the nature of man, but the *parallelism* of the two lines from God to man, is the main subject of investigation.

Mr. Fry's argument, like Butler's, is not addressed to a consideration of the divine nature. Unlike it, it has no concern with the parallelism of the lines above described, but takes *human nature and the fitting in to it of the Christian revelation* as the chief subject of enquiry. To change the figure: if we look upon the Bible revelation of God's dealings with man no longer as part of a mathematical line, but as a *key* made (so it is alleged) to open the lock of man's moral nature, then the design of this treatise is to examine some of the wards of this lock, to compare them with the shape of the key, and to ascertain how far they correspond. In so far as the correspondence is found to be complete does the probability become of irresistible strength that the maker of this most intricate lock made also the key which fits it so perfectly. And by consequence, a presumption equally strong arises that the wards which, by reason of their depth and the darkness of the key-hole, we cannot scrutinize, would, if compared, be found to correspond in a similar manner, and that it is for some one or other of these that each of those strange projections and indentations, the meaning of which is to us yet unexplained, was in reality made aforetime by the Almighty artificer.

We will not, by a dry abstract of these interesting essays, deprive the thoughtful reader of any part of the pleasure which he will derive from their studious perusal. But, in order to give some idea of the style and nature of the argument, we will give a sketch of the second essay, which is, in some respects, the most elaborate of the whole. Its subject is, "The Fall of Man;" its well-chosen Sophoclean motto, "Πολλὰ τὰ δεινὰ, κοῦδὲν ἀνθρώπου δεινότερον πέλει."

In the first chapter the ground is cleared for an *à posteriori* examination of the subject of the fall, by some *à priori* considerations (1) as to the probability of our finding some traces in man's present state of that other and better state from which he fell, if the Scripture account be true, and (2) as to the likelihood of our being able to discover in even a disorganized machine, some indication of the end for which it was originally constructed. This is, in fact, the Aristotelian doctrine of the *τέλος* applied to human nature.

It is remarked, however, parenthetically, that even if the Bible explanation of the phenomena of admitted difficulty in man's nature possessed only the same amount of authority with any other but purely theoretical explanation of them, the weight of external authority ought then to incline the mind of the enquirer in favour of the former.

And as against objections which may be taken to the author's view of human nature from the standing point of High Calvinism, as if he were looking for remnants of good in that which is utterly corrupt, the

Butlerian distinction between the different uses of the term, "nature of man," and the synonyme between *nature* in its highest and best sense, and *conscience*, are well insisted upon.

The second chapter opens with a consideration of the two antagonistic powers at work in man's nature. Illustrations of this antagonism are drawn from the science of politics, from the very nature of law, from history, from philosophy, and from poetry; in the individual man, from those struggles which make up the greater part of every soul's deeper history. It is remarked that this duality and this strife do not arise from the introduction by Christianity of a new code of principles alien to the original nature of man: for some of the men who have recorded it the most faithfully, and reasoned upon it the most deeply, have been heathen philosophers.

There are three hypotheses, our author remarks, by which these phenomena may be accounted for. Either both the rival principles are original, coeval, and equally self-existent, or good is adventitious to evil, or evil to good. Which of these three theories do the facts of human nature tend to confirm? The chief of those facts bearing on this subject are,

a. No one set of the soul's faculties is absolutely good, while a certain other set is absolutely bad; but all of them are capable of good if exercised, as Aristotle would say, *ὡς δεῖ καὶ ὅτε δεῖ, καὶ καθ' ὅσον δεῖ*,—all of them capable of perversion to evil, when the golden mean is not observed.

β. All the rest of these faculties are subordinate, and are felt to be necessarily subordinate, *of right*, to one faculty. That one is conscience; and conscience means the power of discriminating between good and evil.

γ. We speak of good, and we speak of evil; and when we are least inclined to prefer the former in our practice, still we cannot but admit it to be, by its nature, *preferable* to the latter. Moreover, we wonder about the latter, whence it has come; we never so enquire about the former.

"The very heavens have been darkened with treatises on the origin of evil; but comparatively few have enquired into the origin of good. Evil has startled men into thought and enquiry; the good, men have ever quietly accepted, as we do the familiar faces amongst which we have been born and bred."—p. 54.

Applying to these facts his old simile of the machine that has become disorganized, our author argues that not only the second theory (of evil being the basis of our nature, on which good has been super-induced), the very statement of which is felt to be its confutation, but also the far more plausible Manichean theory of two primordial architects of the world, of equal power and antagonistic energies—that theory which has often taken so firm a hold of the oriental mind—must, by these facts, stand condemned.

And thus is a conclusion forced upon us, like to the Biblical one, "that man was originally virtuous and good, and that by some terrible catastrophe the disease of sin has come over him, and marred and

spoiled his original purity and glory,—that man has, in fact, in some way or other, been subjected to a fall.”

The third chapter contains an answer to an objection which, if not formally made, is yet sure to work unconsciously in many minds. There is something in the spirit of that text which states that “in Adam all died,” repugnant to some of the most deeply rooted notions of our age. Without adopting all the eighteenth century jargon about the rights of man, we have, nevertheless, inherited from the French revolutionary era, some vague ideas about the absolute rights of the *individual*,—his prerogative of self-isolation, if he should so choose, from every larger community, from the nation, or from humanity at large, ideas which it is hard enough to reconcile with any well-ordered civil polity, and harder still to bring into accordance with the teaching of the Bible. Yet a lurking notion there probably is, or has been, at some time or another, in the minds of most of us, that each man ought to have the trial of Eden repeated in his own case, that each of us should be created with a will perfectly free both as to good and evil, and at least with no more propensity to choose the latter than the former. In short, like Ezekiel’s contemporaries, we murmur, “The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children’s teeth are set on edge.” To this objection our author replies first by adducing the facts of the case. Whatever ought to be, we certainly do not at any period of our conscious existence, individually stand in this state of primal innocence, and individually fall therefrom.

And further (and here the argument partakes of the nature of Butler’s *Analogy*), we do, in the outward course of the world, continually see men *inheriting* diseases, poverty, and other temporal calamities from their fathers; and we do not see men ever acting, or ever able to act, in that state of complete isolation from all around them,—the rights of the individual in that state of logical abstraction from those of the species, which this objection would require.

The fourth and concluding chapter is devoted to the consideration of two objections to the main argument, which may be drawn (1) from the passion of anger, (2) from the faculty of admiration.

For, 1st, the only account which on the above system can be given of the existence of *anger* in man’s nature, is that it is a perversion and exaggeration of that *righteous indignation against evil*, and especially against injustice or cruelty, which we must suppose the apostle to allude to, when he says, “Be ye angry and sin not.” But then we have here a faculty which even for its *healthy* exercise requires the presupposition of evil; and this militates against the argument that man was originally a creature formed to move in a world from which evil was absent. The answer to this is, that the very notion of probation does carry with it the *possibility* of evil, and consequently necessitates the presence of some faculty for its abhorrence; and, further, that though himself sinless, man might be, and, according to the Scripture account, was, from the very first, liable to contact with other beings who were not so. The disobedience of our first parents brought

sin into the *world*; i. e., into man's moral nature, but not into the *universe*.

2. As for *admiration*, it cannot be denied, says our author, that we do sometimes feel admiration for actions, quite independently of their goodness; nay, even notwithstanding their absolute wickedness. But then he goes on to prove that if we do admire wickedness, it is always wickedness on a gigantic scale, and which, in some way or other, impresses us with an idea of *power*; and this same notion of power is present in those things which have no moral colour whatever, *e. g.*, the great operations of nature, which, nevertheless, compel our admiration. Thus, then, our faculty of admiration has a twofold object—power and goodness: we sometimes admire each singly, but always most strongly those operations which exhibit to us both combined. And a reason for the presence in our nature of such a faculty, may, on our hypothesis, easily be seen; viz., that by admiring power as well as goodness we may be stimulated to endeavour to possess ourselves of a more powerful goodness,—of energies not only tending in the right direction, but also of greater and ever greater intensity,—and thus to struggle upwards towards him, of whose existence even our own natures whisper to us, in whom supreme power and supreme goodness are perfectly combined.

Having detained our readers, we fear too long, over the analysis of this Essay, we must only briefly indicate the subjects which they will find touched upon in the remaining ones. The 3rd is on pain, and its place in the Christian system (especially on the twofold aspect of pain as corrective and retributory); the 4th on the accordance between the doctrines of Christianity and the natural receptivity of the human mind; the 5th on the relation between theory and practice; the 6th on faith; and the 7th on mysteries. The last has not quite so close a connexion with the main subject as most of the others, but is in some respects the most interesting of the whole series.

One word at parting to our author, of whom we hope to hear again as a champion on the old battle-field of the Christian evidences. On that field, one of the noblest which man can fight, he will know that when any enquirer can be induced to bring to the combat a studious mind, and an earnest longing for the truth, the battle is already half fought, as far as speculative apprehension of the Christian religion is concerned. Practical submission of the heart to its power is, we well know, a far other matter. But we would ask him whether, in this age of much reading and little thinking, it is not worth while to make some effort to conciliate the large class of readers who are *not* earnest students, who crave for the concrete, and dread anything in the nature of disquisition, by giving to the present, or any future treatise on a similar subject, a somewhat less abstract form. We say "in this age," but perhaps "we deal not wisely herein." For has it not been a characteristic of every age that the many have been averse to long abstract chains of reasoning, but have loved the concrete and the narrative with almost a child's passion for story. Is it not both an explanation and a

justification of that "picture-alphabet of nature" (as it has been called), by which God has taught us some of the wonderful things concerning himself,—of that long series of successively unfolded narratives by which he has told us the other and greater mysteries of his kingdom? We believe it to be a conviction of this necessity in man's nature, which led Plato to enshrine the jewel of his thoughts in the settling of those wondrous dialogues whose exquisite scene-painting and dramatic vividness of characterization allure us forward into the very heart of the disquisition, before we well perceive that we have done with the narrative. And to take a yet higher example, doubtless the parable-teaching of the New Testament is a gracious condescension to the same needs.

In what way the object should be effected here, may be a matter of doubt. Dialogue might well be one means; the fuller use of metaphor over which, in a condensed form, the present treatise exhibits considerable mastery, might be another. A more frequent reference to history and to the workings *in concreto* of the principles here glanced at *in abstracto*, would be, perhaps, the most successful of all. For instance, in "landing places" like those which Coleridge inserted in his *Friend*, for the benefit of unstudious readers, the historical effects of non-Christian principles, as developed in the old schools of philosophy, might be traced. Or, the influence of the Mohammedan fatalism on the duration of the empires of Islam, or that of the Buddhist doctrine of absorption into the supreme, on the morality of Eastern Asia, might be not incongruous subjects of narrative.

On these points be the author himself judge; and that we may not seem to part from him with a complaint, we will quote from his *Essays* the reflection, illustrated by a metaphor, with which they end:—

"From this it happens that men do not come to the consideration of the evidences of religion with minds enamoured of truth, but perfectly indifferent as to which side is true, but in many men all their wishes, their hopes, and the whole force of the will, oppose the embracing of a belief which leads to so much that is practically difficult; and hence they willingly seize on mysteries as an apparent flaw in the evidence, and as an excuse for refusing unwelcome and painful truth.

"The consciousness of this bias under which our minds are placed, should raise in us a grave caution, if we will act the part of honest and sincere enquirers. For it must never be forgotten, that our intellectual vision may be obscured by moral depravity; and that as dying men, when death is glazing their eyes, are said to fancy that the curtains have been drawn closer round the bed, or the shutters closed on the windows, and to ask impatiently for more light,—so those whose mental vision is obscured by sin and by depraved desires, fancy the darkness to be in revealed religion and not within their own hearts, and complain of the mysteries that are involved in it, and perish asking, but asking in vain, for the access of more light."—p. 216.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek: with Notes, by CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Part I. The Four Gospels. Part II. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Rivingtons. 1856-57.

DR. WORDSWORTH may be considered as representing a school of

divines which, judging from our lately prevalent literature, would appear antiquated, but which still, as we believe, forms the nucleus of the Anglican Church. The principles on which this school confides have been solidly demonstrated by men who may be called the heroes of the Church militant; and in the well-grounded conviction that "these things cannot be spoken against," modern churchmen have too literally followed the advice of the wise Ephesian recorder: *κατεσταλμένους ὑπάρχειν*. It is true, the Church is the "pillar and ground of the truth;" it is true that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it;" but these promises are conditional upon the exercise of a living energy on the part of the Church: "God helps them who help themselves." He is in or with them who are working out their own salvation with fear and trembling; the Church is "militant here on earth;" its rest "remaineth," and it must "labour to enter into that rest." We believe that "the old foundations" are as firm as ever, and that all the real truth which modern researches may have brought to light, can be shewn to belong to them; but they are surrounded by the shifting sands of human folly, and have been partly hidden by the unfruitful drift of these. It may be a laborious task to disencumber the truth from these obstructions, but for the sake of many who are floundering among them it is highly necessary that every one who is able should apply himself to the task.

The position which Dr. Wordsworth occupies, and his view of the present aspect of things, will be understood by some statements of his preface. He thankfully acknowledges that the present age enjoys, in certain respects, greater advantages for the understanding of Holy Writ than were ever possessed before since the revival of learning. But, as in the case of the Jews, the letter of Scripture has been studied, while the spirit has been lost. The palm for industry must be given to the Germans; they are the Masorites of the New Testament, but they have also furnished the Cabbala. Among them the cause of biblical criticism, as a high and holy science, has not made progress; it has degenerated, and is still tending downwards. A gradual decline in the science of sacred interpretation may be observed from the middle of the last century. It began with rationalism, which assumes that no causes were concerned in the events narrated in Scripture but those which are familiar to human experience. This was succeeded by a tendency apparently opposite, viz., that of spiritualizing what was rational—of dissolving facts into fiction. But this again has been succeeded by a tendency still more dangerous: "It pretends to abhor rationalism, and to detest the mythical theories which have sapped the foundations of Scripture. It speaks fair words of Christ, and yet it loves to invent discrepancies, and imagine contradictions . . . it accepts the doctrines of the Gospel, and yet arraigns its documents." The result is that Christendom lies almost a captive at the feet of two of her worst enemies. Rationalism and Rome have made common cause in perverting and obstructing the truth of God's Word.

In speaking of the sources of these evils and their remedy, Dr.

Wordsworth maintains, that no one can rightly interpret Scripture who does not seek and enjoy the teaching of that Spirit by whom they are given; that, inasmuch as Christ has given us the Holy Scripture by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and delivered Scripture to the keeping of the Church universal, and appointed her to be its guardian and interpreter; it is vain to expect that any real progress can be made by the agency of those who deny these things, and that if we hope to maintain the truth, to guard the "faith once delivered to the saints," and to advance the Redeemer's kingdom upon earth; we should, with our own reformers, have ever before our eyes in interpreting Scripture the formularies of faith delivered by the Church universal, as representing the true sense of Scripture; and should not readily imagine that any text of Scripture can be properly bent by us to bear a sense at variance with those standards of the faith. Moreover, no appliances of literature and science, no amount of toil about the *letter* of Scripture, will avail us for obtaining a knowledge of its *spirit*, if we set at nought the means of grace which God offers us for our illumination. These appliances are, indeed, necessary for the right interpretation of the original Scriptures; and it would be fanatical to imagine that we can dispense with any of them. But it is no less fanatical to rely on them as sufficient.

These statements are made in the spirit of love, and in full recollection of the benefit which the Church of England derived from the learning of Germany, when England and Germany were allies in the work of the Reformation. But we should ill repay the debt of gratitude by applauding and fostering her present errors. It becomes us rather to do our best towards "elevating the exegesis of Germany to the standard of primitive Christianity, and to assist her in recovering her ancient dignity."

We agree essentially with all which Dr. Wordsworth has here said, viz., that Scripture will never yield its higher truths to any man who has not been spiritually enlightened, and who does not *enquire of them*, as at an oracle: "*Procul, O procul, este profani!*" and that whoever has most entered into the spirit of God's Word will be most disposed to accept "the things which have been most surely believed" by the Church universal. We feel strongly, too, with Dr. Wordsworth, as to the conduct which reason and duty demand of us towards the modern descendants of the German reformers.

What else would the great and good men, who fought side by side with our reformers, for the restoration and establishment of principles which Germany has abandoned, but which, by the good providence of God, the Church of England has retained, implore of us, than that we should guard well our divine possessions, and that we should "hold forth the Word of Life" as a beacon to the "perverse generation" of their children? These principles and institutions have been to us for ages the bulwarks of Christian order, and the power of God for salvation; and no one who marks well these bulwarks, who knows and feels the strength of his position as an English Churchman, will think the

hope chimerical which Dr. Wordsworth suggests, that a wise and steady maintenance of the truth, combined with an earnest use of our power with God, may do at least something towards guiding embarrassed spirits home. It may be that in the *appliances* of sacred literature modern Germany is entitled to hold its head high; but the admirers of German genius would sadly confound things that differ if they regarded the skill in the preparation of these raw materials, as identical with the grace to use them to the glory of God. No one, we maintain, who feels a reasonable faith in our own position, and compares it with the present aspect of things in Germany, will think it unreasonable to hope, and too much to pray, that the Anglican Church may become a blessing to Europe. Germany herself has had enough, and become weary of blowing prismatic bubbles and seeing them explode; the conservative spirit among them is on the increase; there is a manifest longing, on the part of a goodly number of influential men among them, for a return to the principles of their forefathers. Instead of looking to Rome, whose catholicity is so much overgrown with mediæval and modern corruptions, as even Hengstenberg has done; it is more natural, and perhaps not too much to hope, that he, and such as he, should find in the constitution of the Anglican Church, and in her adherence to Catholic truth, the principles in living exercise which the Protestant Church of Germany has so long lost.

Unfortunately for this object, the voice of the Church in England has for a long time chiefly been heard in notes of discontent, as uttered by two extreme parties. To the one the Reformation itself is regarded as a sin to be repented of; and they are saying to Romish "corruption, Thou art our father." To the other the *order* of the Church is a matter of puritanic discontent, and whatever is abnormal appears the better rule of action.

Dr. Wordsworth is, we believe, equally distant from both these extremes. But we confess it would have been more satisfactory to us, considering the object at which he aims, and the state of things both at home and abroad, if he had dealt somewhat less in assumptions, and shewn afresh *the demonstrative reason* of the faith that is in him. In seeking "to elevate the exegesis of Germany to the standard of primitive Christianity," Dr. Wordsworth ought to mean no more than that the principles and feelings of the early Church in regard to the Word of God, are alone consistent with a discovery of the mind of the Spirit; while that spirit of obedience to the faith is fully consistent with the most perfect freedom in the use of sound methods of investigation.

On cardinal points our conclusions rest partly on other considerations than the exegesis of Scripture, and these have been ruled for us. But this does not apply equally to the details of interpretation. As to many of these the doctors of the early Church were inconsistent with each other. The post-Nicene fathers far surpassed them in a sound acquaintance with the Scripture, and our own great divines treading in their footsteps have still further perfected the science of exegesis.

We have *appliances* superior to those of our most learned forefathers ; and if we could also rise above their measure of the Spirit which leads into all truth, we might still advance the knowledge of God's Word, and clear up difficulties which they left unsolved. The limits of the *authority* of the fathers are well stated in a passage from Bishop Waterland, cited by Dr. Wordsworth : "The early fathers are of some use...for their diction and phraseology, and the *history of the age* in which the books of the New Testament were written...The most ancient fathers may be exceedingly useful for fixing the sense of Scripture in controverted texts....their nearness to the (apostolic) time, their known fidelity, and their admirable endowments add great weight to their testimony or doctrine, and make it a probable rule of interpretation in the *prime things*." It deserves our notice that the fathers of the third and fourth centuries had the advantage of many written accounts of the former ages which have since been lost ; and therefore their testimonies also are of considerable weight, and are a mark of direction to us "*in the main things*." Our own great divines, while they all said with Bishop Hall, "*religio mihi est eritque contra torrentem omnium Patrum S. Scripturas interpretari* ;" made a discriminating use of their opinions in lesser matters, and in which there was no such confluence of their testimony.

No one who studies the writings of our eminent early divines, and of some of their contemporaries—such as Bengel—abroad, can fail to perceive how diligently they sought for the testimony of Scripture itself as to the meaning of its own language ; and we are convinced that the modern neglect of this practice has been one great source of the uncertainty of the results of exegesis, and of their want of coincidence with interpretations which the Church has handed down. In proportion as the Church itself has had the means of this comparative study of the collection of sacred writings, it has become mighty in the Scriptures ; and as advantages of this kind have really accumulated up to the present time, we need only on the part of our accomplished scholars—supposing them to be men of faith—a diligent use of this method to enable them by God's blessing to "understand more than the ancients in divine things."

The value of this work, however, is unquestionably great in exhibiting continually the exegesis of the fathers and of the eminent divines of the Church of England. It contains a rich treasure of this kind, which may keep before the mind of the student the fact that there are few good and true things into which the Church has not ages ago been led, and which is thus adapted to establish his regard for sacred antiquity.

Dr. Wordsworth has devoted some pages to a statement of his views on inspiration. We fully agree with him that it is a vain thing to speculate on the *rationale* of the divine method by which the sacred writers have been guided. The mode by which the Holy Spirit acts, whether in his ordinary influences on good men, or his special operations, is a mystery unknown. That he wields the ordinary arrangements

of Providence for producing spiritual effects, is more than probable; while in some way he acts immediately on the human spirit. In the case of those "holy men of God who spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost," and who were "elect above the rest," to hand down his truth to the world, both these methods may have been employed. If, under his guidance, the natural means of information possessed by a sacred writer were sufficient to give ἀσφάλεια to his tradition, we need not suppose any more supernatural influence. Such a man has been led into the truth. But with regard to things which "eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor human thought devised," God by his Spirit, and by no such natural process, revealed these heavenly things. But, indeed, it is the wisest thing, and the most safe philosophy, to speak with all diffidence on this subject. One thing is certain, that the vulgar notion connected with the word *inspiration* is false as applied to the divine influence which the sacred writers enjoyed. The mental excitement of the poet—with his eye "in a fine phrenzy rolling"—may distinguish him from ordinary mortals; but it has no relation to the θεοπνευστία of the prophets and apostles; it does not of itself convey a particle of the *knowledge* of heavenly things. We are not sure that Dr. Wordsworth himself is free from unsafe speculation on this subject. "May we not," he asks, "say that the mystery of inspiration bears some likeness to the highest of all mysteries, in which the human is joined with the Divine—the mystery of the incarnation itself? There in that mystery is the union of God and man in one Person, without any confusion of substance. But who will attempt to draw the line, where God's work begins and man's ends, in the person of Christ?" But these mysteries are so essentially different that we cannot see how the one at all illustrates the other. Our blessed Lord himself *as man* was endowed, though immeasurably, οὐκ ἐκ μέτρου, with the spirit in the same way and from the same source as were the holy apostles and prophets; but surely this bestowment to the Son of Man is not so to be regarded as a part of his essence as is the divine nature of the Son of God; still less is it joined by a kind of hypostatical union with the nature of inspired men. No theory of inspiration, in short, which we have ever met with, devised for the purpose of defining or even illustrating the mode in which God communicates with the human spirit, affords any real light on the subject; and because all are open to objections and cavils, they have become the occasion of doubts as to the reality of inspiration itself. The example of our Lord himself and his apostles, who received the Old Testament Scriptures as the Word of God, without intimating how they were so, is a safe and authoritative guide for us.

Dr. Wordsworth's doctrine as to the results of this divine teaching is that of the infallibility of the sacred writers.

"We know," says he, "that 'holy men of old spoke as they were moved by the Holy Ghost,' and therefore the Scriptures which the Holy Ghost has given by them, are 'the things that are able to make us wise unto salvation, through faith that is in Christ Jesus.' This may be proved by arguments external and internal. And since

it may be proved, it can never be granted that there are any, even the least, inaccuracies in the New Testament. If one man imagines that there are two or three inaccuracies, another person, equally learned, may allege that there are four or five; and so on indefinitely, till at last the claim of the Scriptures to be regarded as the Word of God and the rule of faith is destroyed."

This was the creed of St. Augustine: "I confess that I have learned to pay this deference to the books of Scripture, and to them alone, that I most firmly believe that none of their writers have ever fallen into any error of writing." We are at least prepared to say this much, that if there be any errors in the New Testament, we had rather err with the apostles, than take our chance of being right with other men. The assumption of most who object to this doctrine virtually is that we have in the sacred writings nothing more than the subjective results of human thought; and the innumerable mistakes, contradictions, etc., which are charged upon the sacred writers, are disingenuously heaped together to sustain this hypothesis. It is a much easier thing to acquiesce in such objections than to refute them; but we are confident that the real difficulties of this kind may be reduced to so narrow a compass that they would probably entirely vanish if there were not some deficiency either in our judgment or our means. Dr. Wordsworth has in the course of his Commentary noticed many of them, and replied to them with various degrees of success.

His remarks on the text of the New Testament are many of them true, but he does not appear to us to have grappled with the difficulties of the subject, and indeed we know of no writer who has. He acknowledges the advantage the present age possesses in the collation of manuscripts, but doubts whether these advantages have hitherto been rightly used. The canons of criticism which have been propounded contain right principles, but have been overstrained in their application. The maxim "*Proclivi lectioni præstet ardua*," however true in general, may be absurdly applied. The exclusive preference of individual uncial manuscripts is unreasonable. A better acquaintance with the history of the cursive manuscripts might shew that their readings are ancient, while their materials are less so than those of the uncials. We have been long impressed with this idea. The history of the cursive manuscripts has been comparatively neglected in the *éclat* which the uncial manuscripts have enjoyed. But the former are so numerous, and come to us from so many parts of the world, that their concurrent testimony is not to be lightly rejected. The classification of manuscripts into families is as yet too much of an hypothesis in its details to afford any certain ground of critical judgment. On the whole, our own conviction is, that the science of criticism has been so long, and almost entirely, in the hands of men whose method is the opposite of inductive, that it is not as yet a sufficient basis for determining our text as a whole. The labours of Tischendorf are worthy of all thankfulness and admiration; a few among ourselves have done something in this field, but we have had no edition as yet which has established an undoubted claim to general acceptance. The text of the present work,

though not identical with the text of Stephens, is more nearly so than that of some recent editions, and Dr. Wordsworth has not indicated any general principles on which his readings have been adopted. He refers us to the labours of others for the purpose of "ascertaining the process by which the present edition has been formed." But this reference is nothing less than to a list of all the chief writers on this subject from Erasmus downwards.

Our remarks on the general principles of which Dr. Wordsworth is the exponent, have occupied too much space for us to enter upon some particulars in his notes, which appear to call for remark. In a subsequent notice we hope to enter into the interior of his valuable work, and especially to consider his treatment of the Fourth Gospel and the Acts of the Apostles.

Christian Orthodoxy reconciled with the conclusions of modern Biblical Learning ; a Theological Essay, with critical and controversial supplements. By JOHN WILLIAM DONALDSON, D.D., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. London and Edinburgh: Williams and Norgate. 8vo. pp. xxxii, 376.

WE regard the title of this book as something ominous. "Christian orthodoxy reconciled with the conclusions of modern Biblical learning" is a phrase which grates upon the ear, and leads us to unpleasant surmises. Is it a fact that Christian orthodoxy and modern Biblical learning are antagonistic? If so, is Christian orthodoxy the offending party? So it would seem, as it needs to be reconciled with the other. The preface, however, declares that the object of the book is "to make the evidences of our religion independent of all those objections which have been successfully urged by its opponents; to shew that the faith, which is to render us happy here and hereafter, does not rest on floating clouds of human dogmas, opinions, assumptions, and superstitions, but stands fixed on the granite basis of inherent truth and historic certainty." To accomplish this object the author tells us he has come forward, like Aaron, with "an offering of reconciliation, to stay the plague of unbelief, which has for some time followed in the train of a dishonest bibliolatry!" However laudable the object, we feel anxious for the man who assumes a position so critical. It is to be feared he has mistaken the course to be pursued, and that he is of the "peace-at-any-price" party. As we proceed, we find that our apprehensions are not groundless, and we discover that the learned doctor does battle rather for the foes than for the friends of Christian orthodoxy; that he surrenders many of the supposed strongholds of the faith, and that he indulges in reflections of the most bitter and unwarrantable description upon those who have the misfortune to differ from him. He calls his book, "from first to last, a protest against theological warfare and dogmatic intolerance;" but it is in our opinion an unparalleled example of the one and of the other. It is warlike in

every sense of the word as against those who hold to the old Christian orthodoxy, and everywhere dogmatically intolerant. The author is unable to conclude even his preface without exhibitions of the acrimony and ungentle temper which abound in the work itself.

The first chapter, on "the characteristics and qualifications of a Christian advocate," is not without many observations in which we cordially concur. But we are constrained to think that the writer has embraced a very partial and so far mistaken idea of his subject. The warfare which the Christian is called to, is not merely that internal conflict with evil which an apostle knew so well how to describe; it is also a warfare against the sin, ignorance, and error which are in the world. It is absurd to abuse all who do not see with him, and who stand up for the Bible in its integrity, as slavish and benighted bibliolaters. And it requires a large amount of Christian charity and forbearance to listen quietly to a man who professes so much, and who exhibits so little of those very qualities which he commends. In the most reckless way, he brandishes his sword right and left against what we may call the orthodox class, and aims to establish principles which would lead to the utmost latitudinarianism in regard to religious doctrines and ceremonies.

The appendix on "The Connexion between Revealed Religion and the Natural and Moral History of Man," is open to objection. In particular we except to his well-known and abominable interpretation of the narrative of the Fall in Genesis, and to his views of the nature of Christ, whose victory he makes to consist in his successful conflict with the lower passions which dwelt in him. What authority has he for saying that in Eph. vi. 12, etc., St. Paul *adopted* the phraseology of the Gnostics?

Chapter the second is on "The True Defence of the Faith." A curious method of defending the faith certainly, to maintain that there are no evil spirits, nor good angels, to maintain that religious ceremonies and external worship are of small importance, to assert that Moses only wrote one book of the Pentateuch, and that the Bible is a compound of the weak and beggarly elements of human tradition, and the Word of God! Yet this is what is here done. The author exerts all his ingenuity to shew that the Bible is the most corrupt book in existence, and that those who do not think so are the most stupid of men. He who asserts that the Jewish ceremonial law was not from Moses, but the forged ritual of a sacerdotal caste, that the historical books of the Bible are full of fables and perversions of fact, that only a part of the prophecies of Isaiah are genuine, and that the books of Job, Daniel, and Joshua are spurious modern compilations, is a defender of the faith *sui generis*. And such is Dr. Donaldson, the Aaron, as he calls himself, standing between the living and the dead with his offering of reconciliation! If this is reconciliation, we want none of it, and would rather remain at eternal enmity to all the scepticism and unbelief of modern science.

In the most unheard-of manner, our new defender of the faith

accuses the apostles of error, and temporizing, from which latter charge he does not exempt even our blessed Lord himself, when he makes him say what He knew was not true. He cuts down the inspired canon in the most dashing style, rejecting whole books from both Testaments, and weeding out of those which remain all that he does not approve; so that a miserable remnant only escapes to receive his infallible imprimatur. His account of the origin and growth of the Old Testament canon is without exception the most suicidal act of which we have known any man guilty. The defence of Jashar is a feeble display, rather to save appearances than to justify that literary monstrosity. Besides, it comes too late, the book has been read and held up effectually to the ridicule and contempt of the scholars of Europe and America.

Having succeeded so admirably with the Old Testament, and in his casual raids upon the New, it is but to be expected that his account of the character and connexion of the four Gospels will exhibit similar characteristics. And so indeed it does. All the apparent discrepancies are held up to view, with the objections of unbelievers; not in order to shew that these discrepancies are only apparent, and that these objections have been all well met. Of course not; but to ignore explanations and refutations at the expense of the sacred writers. We do not ask if this is honourable; but if it is honest. There are things in this section which by some would be called litigious, but which we shall simply call stupid. Such is his saying that Luke took his name from Lucan the Roman poet, and Paul his from Sergius Paulus. To the same amiable feature we must refer the sympathy and respect with which ancient and modern heretics are uniformly regarded, as compared with the acerbity and indignation which are so liberally dispensed among the defenders and friends of orthodoxy. It might perhaps be said that "fellow feeling makes us wondrous kind," and that our author is so friendly to the heretics because he so much resembles not a few of them. That this may not pass without proof, we shall mention a few instances, and probably more could be found if we were disposed to search for them. The ancient Sadducees denied the existence of good and bad angels; so does Dr. D. Porphyry denied the authenticity of the book of Daniel; so does Dr. D. The Herodians received only the Gospel of Mark, and Dr. D. places it before and above the rest. The Socinians reject the first two chapters of St. Matthew; and Dr. D. throws doubts upon their genuineness. Dositheus is said to have denied the existence of angels; so does Dr. D. The Manichæans, Gnostics, Nicolaitans, Valentinians, Ebionites, Encratites, Apotactics, and Priscilianists, called in question the canon in various respects; so also does Dr. D. There have been some who particularly objected to parts of the Old Testament, either to separate books or individual portions, as the history of the fall and of the deluge, in which it is needless to observe, they resemble Dr. D. To name no more, the doctrine of inspiration in the

orthodox sense, has been frequently opposed, as it is in this volume. The truth is, that the great majority of objectionable positions assumed in this work have been already assumed by other men. The book, therefore, is less original than it might at first appear to be, and may be regarded as a *rifacimento* (to use a word applied by its author to the Old Testament) a hashing up of the heterogeneous morsels of heresy, false criticism, and unbelief. And this is the reconciliation of Christian orthodoxy with the conclusions of modern Biblical learning! What! have the opponents of the Sadducees, of Porphyry, and of heretics in general in all ages, been wrong, and the heretics all right? Far be it from us to say that so-called heretics have never been right, but here is a man who comes boldly forward and asks us to receive some of their most notorious errors; and who asks us to do this on the plea that modern Biblical learning requires it. To call this nonsense is to use the mildest term. Biblical learning has in modern times so circumvallated and fortified Christian orthodoxy, especially in reference to questions concerning the evidences and interpretation of the Scriptures, that there is nothing to fear. Modern infidelity has been answered till it is almost ashamed to propound its objections by daylight except among the ignorant, and is driven to devise new means of attack. German rationalism has exhausted its entire arsenal, and defection from its ranks has been all but general. A stolid, reckless Atheism, Pantheism, Materialism, Secularism, indifference, or whatever you may call it, is almost all that remains for the educated who do not love the Bible. The Church of Christ displays an energy, a confidence, and a courage on behalf of revealed truth, which would do honour to any age. And many as may be the failings, errors, and superstitions of those who profess faith in the Gospel, it is our firm and deliberate conviction, that the grounds of our faith were never more tangible, and that faith itself was never more intelligent. There are cases in which learning, talent, ingenuity and zeal are sadly misapplied, as in the case before us; and where men aim at a right end in a wrong way. It is doubtless desirable "to make the evidences of our religion independent of all those objections which have been successfully urged by its opponents." But it is at least very eccentric to attempt to do this, by admitting that most of those objections are true, so far as they directly aim at the Bible; and by trying to demonstrate that the charter of our faith is the most corrupt and interpolated document in existence: nay more, by endeavouring to shew that its inspiration is little or nothing more than necessarily belongs to writings upon such high themes. What should we think of the general who should profess to defend a city by making public all the faults of its garrison and of its fortifications? would it not be at least fair to question his sanity, if not his patriotism? We repeat it is not merely the end, but the measures taken to reach it. They tell us that Icarus flew from Crete to escape from danger, but the sun melted the wax which cemented his wings, and he fell into the sea. The object was laudable,

but the means were absurd, and the result ludicrously disastrous. In the case of our author, his object is very good, but he never approaches it, and by such means he never will.

Many points in this book suggest reflections of a very serious character, and if our space permitted we would examine some of the matters we refer to, but as our object is rather to write a general notice than a detailed criticism, we must resist a strong temptation. Justice, however, both to the writer and to ourselves, seems to require some confirmation of our observations above what we have given. We are unwilling that our strictures should rest upon mere assertion. Far rather would we permit our author to speak for himself. This we shall proceed to do, and in so doing shall select a passage or two which, while but a very small portion of the sort of thing which here abounds, will illustrate and confirm our remarks on the temper, tendencies, and false conclusions of the book. The first passage we select is for the sake of its theology and criticism.

“This is the consistent doctrine of the Apostles, who represent the victory of Christ over sin and death, as a triumph of the Spirit over the flesh, of the divine over the merely animal element in the nature of man. St. Paul says (Rom. i. 3, 4), that Jesus Christ, ‘who was born of the seed of David according to his flesh (*κατὰ σάρκα*), was declared to be the Son of God, with power according to the spirit of holiness by the resurrection from the dead’ (*ἐν δυνάμει κατὰ πνεῦμα ἁγιωσύνης ἐξ ἀναστάσεως νεκρῶν*). In the same way St. Peter says (1 Peter iii. 19) that Jesus Christ ‘was put to death in the flesh, but made alive in the spirit.’ It was this successful contest with his lower nature which constituted his sinlessness. If there had been no passion, no liability to temptation in his lower nature, if, in fact, he had not been man, as we are men, there could have been no contest, and, consequently, there would have been no victory, and no example or encouragement for us to hope to obtain the resurrection and a similar exaltation of our nature. But it is expressly stated that he had our nature with its liability to sin and its subjection to the condemnation of the law. St. Paul says (Gal. iv. 4): ‘When the fulness of time had come, God sent forth his Son born of a woman, and so born under the law, in order that he might redeem those who were under the law.’ Again he says more fully (Rom. viii. 3, 4): ‘The law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus has liberated me from the law of sin and death; for when the law was incompetent from its carnal weakness (*ἐν ᾧ ἡσθένει διὰ τῆς σαρκός*), God by sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh (*ἐν ὁμοιώματι σαρκὸς ἁμαρτίας*), and as a sacrifice for sin, condemned the sin in the flesh, in order that the righteousness of the law may be fulfilled in us who walk not according to the flesh but according to the spirit.’ In this assumption of our flesh, with its liability to sin, which made it obnoxious to the law, consisted the reconciliation or atonement between the human and divine, which was the result of the self-sacrifice of Jesus. God ‘reconciled us to himself through Christ,’ because ‘God was in Christ reconciling the world to himself’ (2 Cor. v. 18, 19). ‘He made him, who—in his divine nature—had not known sin, to be sin for us, that we might become the righteousness of God in him’ (*ibid.*, v. 21). For although ‘Christ did no sin,’ he ‘carried up our sins in his body to the cross, in order that we being free from sin might live in righteousness, and be healed by the blow inflicted on him’ (1 Peter ii. 22, 24). In this way he stripped off from himself the powers of sin and darkness, the natural sinfulness and mortality of human flesh, and triumphed over it on his cross (Col. ii. 15); and it was only by his sufferings that he was made perfect (Heb. ii. 10). Until this triumph was effected, and his human nature thereby transformed and exalted (Phil. ii. 20), he was in all respects like his brother men (Heb. ii. 17, 18), and was able to sympathize with our weakness, because, although actually sinless, he was tempted in all respects as we are. (Heb. iv. 15.)”—pp. 59, 60.

The next may illustrate the treatment which the Mosaic economy receives at the hands of Dr. D.

"With respect to Judaism, it is to be remembered, in the first place, that Christianity stands surety for the divine origin of all that is spiritual in the creed of Moses—that is, for its essence or substantial reality. All the Levitical rites are abrogated by Jesus, the machinery of a priesthood, a temple, a succession of festivals, and a minute arrangement of sacrificial ordinances, were set aside by him, and in all probability were not of Mosaic origin: but he has declared that no jot or tittle shall be taken from that divine law which is summed up in the two commands, that we should love God above all things, and our neighbour as ourselves."—pp. 116, 117.

The following sentences are at least characteristic:—

"Christianity has made itself responsible, not only for the truth of Judaism, to which we attribute an authority scarcely less divine than that of Christianity itself, but also for a belief in good and bad angels, which is clearly traceable to a human origin. Learning and science repudiate these dogmas: there is no leading man in any sect who will attempt to defend them on scientific principles, and the pleas by which they are generally supported are so irrational, that we can hardly resist the occasional suspicion that they are brought forward with a secret conviction of their worthlessness, and with the dishonest intention of deluding the ignorant and superstitious into a belief, which may strengthen the authority of the priestly conscience-keeper.

"Such is the fatal obstinacy of those who identify human error with divine truth, that an able, and, in one sense, learned Bishop, has told his assembled clergy that a man can hardly deny the received theory of inspiration without calling in question the historical evidences of Christianity, and so advancing one step towards the rejection of the Gospel as a revelation from God. And evangelical clergymen, who endeavour to compensate for a lack of critical learning and argumentative ability by loud denunciations of those who differ from them, have been known to wind up a Manichæan sermon with the astounding declaration, that, if we do not believe in the personal and eternal existence of the devil, we must relinquish all faith in God and in Christ! If it can be shewn that these dogmas are quite unconnected with the truths of revelation, and quite untenable even on theological grounds, what shall we say of those whose faith is dependent on their maintenance? Do they deserve to be called the advocates of Christianity? Are they even worthy of being termed the friends of religious faith? And are not both names more properly applicable to those who would set our religion free from the necessity of sanctioning indefensible error?"—pp. 123—125.

Our Lord's appeals to the Old Testament are thus disposed of:—

"Waiving any question as to our Lord's human infallibility before the resurrection, there is internal evidence that we do not know the exact terms in which Jesus Christ cited the Old Testament. For example, in the three accounts of the same transaction, he is said to have cited the third chapter of Exodus in three different forms of speech. Assuming that any one of these three citations was an infallibly accurate statement of the very words which Jesus used, it is obvious that the other two are inaccurate; and as we cannot know which of the three is to be preferred, we must conclude that there is no certainty as to the fact that he called the book of Exodus 'the book of Moses.' Again, even if we had this certainty, we cannot be confident that he did not acquiesce in a merely conventional expression, just as intelligent clergymen among ourselves talk of the Creed of Athanasius, although they know that the Symbol so designated was written in France one hundred years after the death of that Father. And that Jesus Christ did not regard the books attributed to Moses as divine and infallible is proved by the fact that he abrogated the ritual and ceremonial law of the Jews, without stating that he did this in virtue of his divine authority, or because that law, though divine, was instituted by God to serve a temporary purpose. On the contrary, he declared expressly that he came to

fulfil, not to destroy, the moral law,—that heaven and earth should pass away before that law suffered the least diminution. He did, therefore, most emphatically distinguish between the spirit of the decalogue and the Levitical ordinances of his own countrymen, and both by his words and actions signified that the one was divine and eternal, the other human and temporary.”—pp. 155, 156.

Perhaps a paragraph more unfair than this which follows was never penned even by our worst enemies :—

“ Now the following are the results of the inquiry by which it has been discovered that the assumption of the infallibility of Scripture is contrary to the facts of the case ; and these results are derived, as we have already intimated, from two distinct branches of modern science—inductive philosophy and philological criticism.

“ Since the days of Galileo and Copernicus, an opinion has been gaining strength that the writers of the Old Testament were, as might have been expected from the age in which they lived, simply and entirely ignorant of the facts of physical astronomy. No rational and educated man will now believe that God made the round world so fast that it never should move at any time ; or that the sun and moon and stars revolve around the globe, and were created subsequently to this planet, and solely for the purpose of giving light upon the earth ; or that the atmosphere is a solid expanse or firmament, with doors and windows to allow the passage of the rain ; or that the rainbow was fixed in heaven for a sign, after the world had existed some 2000 years, and consequently that there was no rain before the first appearance of that phenomenon. To say nothing about the sun standing still upon Gibeon, or on the dial of Ahaz, the erroneous conceptions, to which we have referred, are sufficient to assure us that the writers of the Old Testament, so far from being infallible on the subject of cosmogony, had neither more nor less knowledge than their contemporaries ; in other words, they were utterly ignorant of the facts which modern science has discovered and demonstrated. This appears still more clearly when we call in the aid of geology, which teaches us that the work of creation did not take place in six periods of twenty-four hours each, but in a succession of incalculable ages ; and that the phenomena attributed to an universal deluge, long subsequent to the origin of man, are really due to the lacustrine period which preceded the development of dry and solid earth, capable of furnishing a healthy abode to our species. Even natural history, which already counts more than 307,944 species of breathing creatures, independently of fishes and infusoria, pronounces sentence upon the ignorance of a writer who supposes it possible that an ark 500 feet long, 82 feet wide, and 50 feet high, could contain at least duplicates of every zoological specimen, such as live in the water being alone excepted, together with their appropriate food for 110 days ! Unless, indeed, we adopt the very rational supposition that the deluge of Noah, like that of Deucalion, was only partial, and affected only those tribes who descended at a very early period from the mountains of Armenia to the Mesopotamian plains ; but then there would be no occasion for the formation of a floating menagerie, and we should only substitute a charge of inaccuracy and exaggeration for one of simple ignorance of the facts of natural history.

“ An attempt has been occasionally made to get rid of these difficulties by a mode of interpretation, which, if it is put forward in good faith, is eminently puerile and absurd. The plainest meaning of the Hebrew text is perverted, in order to extract a sense in accordance with the deductions of modern science. But whatever partial success this endeavour may have had on the minds of the indolent and careless, who have prejudged the case, it is obvious that the removal of any objections on the score of physical science could have no effect on the issue of the questions raised by philological criticism.”—pp. 156—158.

On the canonical authority of the New Testament, our redoubtable defender of the faith speaks in this way :—

“ Biblical criticism starts from the point of view conceded by the Church historians, and every result of an examination is in favour of the judgment displayed

by those who placed a mark of doubt on some of the so-called Apostolic Epistles. There is internal evidence to shew that the epistle attributed to Jude was not written by any apostle or in the time of the apostles, and that the second epistle, attributed to Peter, was coined in the same mint, or derived from the same common source. The apostolic origin of some of the other epistles might justly be called in question; and though the genuineness of the historical books—in their original form—may be considered as sufficiently established, want of manuscript evidence or incoherences of style and matter would induce the critical scholar to omit or inclose in brackets many passages of greater or less importance. Thus, the first two chapters of the Gospel according to Matthew are obviously a preface of inferior authority borrowed from some other source; and the whole Gospel, as we have it, is, by almost universal agreement, regarded as a mere translation from an Aramæan or Hebrew original; and if this were extant, the Greek text, which contains many obvious errors, would sink to the same rank as the Alexandrine version of the Old Testament. With regard to the only prophetic book, the Apocalypse, although there are reasons for the prevalent belief that the author was the apostle John, there have been many who have attributed it to a Presbyter of Ephesus who bore the same name.”—pp. 159, 160.

The gentle treatment received by the Old Testament may be inferred from the sentences here quoted:—

“It is scarcely necessary to remark that the proofs of an unequal authority, furnished by this examination of the Scriptures, are no less fatal to the theory of an infallible dictation, or even guidance, than the results of physical science, when compared with the statements of the older books. For if we have compilations from older writings, in prose and verse, sometimes cited, and sometimes quoted at length—if the greater part of the Hebrew collection is of the nature of a *rificamento*, or modernized edition and remodelled abbreviation or expansion of old fragmentary remains—and if we have translations from lost works by the side of genuine relics, it is impossible to believe that such a farrago can possess, as a totality, the unvarying impress of a celestial sanction, extending to every detail, however minute and insignificant, and claiming infallible accuracy, as well for the passage quoted, as for the work in which the quotation appears, with comments more or less erroneous. With regard to the longest and most circumstantial of the four Gospels, it has been admitted, by the warmest defenders of the cause, that its authority would be precarious and uncertain, and its value and claim to respect almost set aside, if the general tradition respecting it were to be received. And yet this general tradition, which represents the extant Gospel of St. Matthew as the anonymous translation of a lost original, is confirmed by every available testimony; and it has never been shewn that its claim to a canonical authority is less than that of the other Gospels, which are as universally supposed to be original works. The theory of inspired dictation, or literary infallibility, takes account of the canonical books only, but extends itself to all of them without reservation or exception. Consequently, the tradition, which constitutes the canon of Scripture, is the sole criterion of infallible authority; and if it is admitted that any document, though canonical, is yet of uncertain or precarious importance, it must follow that a place in the canon does not bestow a character of infallibility, and that the theory of inspired dictation or guidance is not more applicable to a canonical work, than to any other ancient writing.”—pp. 162, 163.

Having charged the author of the strange book under notice with want of candour, we illustrate our meaning by his own words:—

“And in general it might be urged that minute accuracy of citation could scarcely be expected from a writer who attributes to Jeremiah a passage from Zechariah. (Matt. xxvii. 9.)”—pp. 193, 194.

Here he ignores the fact that there are many important authorities

for leaving out the word *Jeremiah* altogether. A second example we shall select from among a number, from p. 290, where the reference is to the "gift of tongues :"—

"That this *glossolalia* was not speaking a foreign language, is clear from 1 Cor. xiv. 11, where such a speaker is opposed to the *βάρβαρος*, or foreigner. It was rather a speaking with new sounds unheard of before (*καιναὶ γλῶσσαι*, Mark xvi. 17), and in languages different from those which are commonly spoken, (*ἕτεραι γλῶσσαι*, Acts ii. 4; 1 Cor. xiv. 21). In point of fact, the Apostles are never said to have spoken in any language except those which they learned by human means. And with regard to the miracle of Pentecost, it is clear that they would not have been charged with drunkenness if they had merely spoken in foreign tongues, which some, at least, of their hearers professed to understand. Bunsen does not deny that the disciples at Pentecost began with unintelligible articulations, from which they passed to their native dialects. Circumstances mentioned in Acts ii. are quite incompatible with the ordinary view of the matter, and nothing there mentioned is really inconsistent with the view respecting *glossolalia*, which may be derived from St. Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians."

It is surely a sufficient answer to this to quote Acts ii. 6—12, which could not have been overlooked. The very next page to the one now quoted from furnishes another illustration in reference to the Conversion of St. Paul.

From the passages on inspiration we give the following :—

"For if we were entitled to assume that God must have left us an infallible record of his revelations, we should assume, on the same principle, that the record must have been free from ambiguity or contradiction : we should, therefore, *à priori*, conclude that we cannot have such an infallible record in the historical books of the Old Testament, which are confessedly a patch-work compilation from older works, now lost ; we should expect that the history of Jesus Christ would be preserved in some single document, and we should be unable to recognize anything but human authorship in four distinct treatises, one of them the translation of a lost original, and all of them presenting discrepancies more or less serious ; and the presumption of supernatural guidance would seem to us contradicted by the fact that books, which the early Church regarded with suspicion and doubt, have been invested by the later Church with the attributes of divine authority."—p. 317.

Speaking of Mr. Macnaught's book on inspiration, he concludes thus :—

"In fact, Mr. Macnaught's book on Inspiration is one of the class of works which we most wish to see in the hands of those respectable and serious, but ignorant and narrow-minded citizens of the middle class, who give importance to the Cummings, McNeiles, Baylees, and Mintons ; who accept, as exclusive Christianity, their mixture of Judaism and Calvinism ; who construe the prohibition of labour on the Jewish Sabbath into a prohibition of innocent recreation on the Christian Sunday ; and who enable the proprietors of such journals as the *Record* to count upon that which they probably value more than even the gratification of their arrogance and malignity—a remunerative circulation."—p. 341.

Perhaps one of the richest portions of the whole book is the chapter which treats of "The supposed existence of intermediate intelligences." With the most desperate disregard of fact, he affirms that "we have heard nothing of angels since the publication of the Acts of the Apostles ;" for he cannot but know that references are found to angels in subsequent books of the New Testament. With incredible absurdity he applies to his subject the phrase "*de non apparentibus et de non*

existentibus eadem est ratio." He even endeavours to prove that the idea of angelic forms is unknown to Jewish writers prior to the captivity, and that it is traceable to a Pagan and mythical origin. We can only find room for one morsel of this precious piece.

"The violent wind has in all mythologies, Oriental as well as Greek, a symbolical form combining the ideas of strength and velocity. Wings typify the rapid motion of the gale; the beak and talons of the eagle, sometimes the claws of the lion, are called in to shew how the tornado seizes on and carries off its prey. It is highly interesting to know that in almost all languages this compound symbol was expressed by the root, which enters into the Hebrew *k'rûb* or *cherub*, and which seems to denote the power of seizing or snatching. Thus we have the Greek *harp-ies*, which Homer designates as stormy winds; the Persian *gryf-ons*, which guarded the gold; the Egyptian sphinx, probably termed *k'rabu*, which watched over the sepulchres; and the Greek *kerb-erus*, which barred the entrance to Hades."—p. 354.

It is with reluctance that we refrain from breaking a lance with the Doctor on this subject, and especially with reference to the angelic appearances and ministrations recorded in the New Testament. Explained away they cannot be, and the only resource of a candid mind is to deny the truth of the narrative. No theory of interpretation that ever was invented can account for these passages, if their historical character is denied. Certainly the effort here made to disprove the existence of angels and devils is an utter failure.

There are three subjects touched upon in the volume to which we can only refer—the Revision of the Liturgy—the National Church—and the Athanasian Creed. Of the latter we must confess our surprise at finding the author a zealous defender.

Here then we shall take our leave of one of the most mischievous books which it has been our lot to meet with in the English language. The learning of the author, his zeal for some forms of piety, and the advantages of style and talent, only make us more confirmed in our judgment. Had he professed himself an enemy, the case would have been somewhat different. But he is a member and a priest of the English Church, with an established reputation for scholarship. Still we think the influence of the book for evil will be comparatively small. It is a worthy pendant to Jashar, and will be consigned to the same oblivion. If he had not previously published Jashar, the world would have been taken somewhat by surprise. As it is, this work will be regarded with grief by his friends, who will regret that a man like him should so abuse his talents. Throughout it is too overstrained to commend itself to any but the weakest and most superficial. The violent temper which it exhibits is too patent, and its statements too undisguised for his purpose. Even where there is an attempt to bolster up his assertions by argument and criticism, the argument is so feeble, and the criticism so uncritical, that very few will be unprepared with an immediate response. Our task has been a light one, and is rather to be regarded as a protest against such rash and unprofitable speculation than a refutation of the author's errors, or a defence of the truth.

Proofs of the Interpolation of the Vowel-Letters in the Text of the Hebrew Bible, and Grounds thence derived for a Revision of its Authorised English Version. By CHARLES WILLIAM WALL, D.D., Vice-Provost of Trinity College, Dublin. London: Whitaker and Co. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co. 8vo. pp. xxx, and 634.

If we did not know that this volume is the learned production of a well-read man and sound scholar, we might be disposed, from its title, to treat it as a satire on the recent mania for Biblical revision. We are surrounded by scriptural optimists, who advocate a literal perfectibility for the inspired documents of Divine Revelation, such as God has hitherto denied to us, and such indeed as may be shewn to be morally impossible. A satirist, intending to reprove this amiable but weak class of minds, might well lead them to the fountain of all Biblical literature, the autographs of the writers of the Old Testament, and bid them revise a text which, in part, is more than three thousand years old. The task would be an attractive one to our Biblical perfectionist, and we can imagine him seriously undertaking it, until its utter hopelessness would open his eyes, and he would see that his credulity had made him an object of ridicule.

Yet there is a germ of truth in the error to which we are referring, as there is in most mental vagaries. The proper method of revising the Scriptures is certainly to begin with the original texts, and to make them as pure as possible; but then the critic must recognize the laws by which he is circumscribed—the barriers which, like a wall of adamant, place limits to his investigations. Now what are the bounds within which the criticism of the Hebrew Bible must be confined, but the existing MSS. and editions? Beyond these we may conjecture much, and form some shrewd guesses from the readings of the LXX., the Vulgate and the Syriac versions, and other sources, but they must ever remain guesses and nothing more. Reasoning on the fact that Hebrew was unpointed when a living language, we may be almost sure that the learned Massorites have in some cases misled us, but we must remain contented with their text notwithstanding. While competent scholars may feel pretty sure that corrections here and there would make both the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures more like the originals, their good sense shews them that conjecture can have no authority; and that as Divine Providence has seen fit to allow inspired books to suffer the accidents of time, and human caprice, and carelessness, we must believe that as perfection in this high department of knowledge is impossible, it is therefore unnecessary for the purposes which Revelation contemplates.

Dr. Wall would go up higher than the Massorites, and reclaim the Hebrew Text from what he thinks to be the foreign incrustations of more than sixteen hundred years. We say that this is an impossible task, and therefore we might dismiss the volume as an impracticable one, the work of a learned enthusiast. But to do so would neither be just to the author nor in accordance with the pleasure and interest

which his labours have afforded us. Like the long toil of the alchemists, Dr. Wall's studies in this department of sacred literature are fruitful in benefits while missing their aim. We will, therefore, convey to our readers, as briefly as possible, what is to be expected from this erudite production of the Vice-Provost of Trinity College, Dublin.

The following are the *data* on which Dr. Wall would build up the theory, and defend the practical suggestions of his volume:—

“ In the first place, about two centuries after the termination of the Babylonian captivity, and while a considerable number of persons continued to speak pure Hebrew as their vernacular dialect, Asia was invaded by a people who had introduced into the original alphabet the vast improvement of vowel-letters, and the Jews were in consequence, in spite of their prejudices, forced to learn a species of writing that made them acquainted with the use of such letters.

“ In the second place, the Scriptures were very soon afterwards translated into the tongue connected with this writing, by the order, tradition tells us, of a Pagan government, and at any rate in a country in which they and their religion were peculiarly hated and despised. This rendering of the Old Testament into Greek—a language at the time understood throughout the civilized portion of the world—has always been considered most providential in serving the important use of preparing the minds of the Gentiles for the reception of the Gospel. . . . But a further service may now be perceived to have been performed by the LXX., in tending to reconcile the Jews to the use of the Greek alphabet, and render them less averse to borrowing thence, in like manner as other Shemitic nations had previously done, a very important improvement in their ordinary writing. Accordingly, the legends upon extant coins of their country, that were stamped during the high-priesthood of Sinai of the Hasmonean race, shew that they occasionally employed *Waw* and *Yod* as vowel-letters, within less than two centuries after the death of Alexander the Macedonian conqueror; and if Hebrew inscriptions of greater age could be procured, we should most probably find that they commenced this alteration of their original practice still sooner and nearer to that epoch.

“ In the third place, all their scruples were at length overcome by the violence of their enmity to Christians; and they were induced to extend the benefit of this Pagan innovation from their ordinary to their sacred writings in the early part of the second century of our era, on account of the opportunity it afforded them of perverting the sense of prophecies relating to the divinity of Jesus, etc.

“ In the fourth place, the vocalization of the Hebrew record with letters (*Haleph*, *Yod*, and *Waw*) having been by far too scanty to keep it permanently legible, we find that, according as a fuller system of vowel-signs became requisite for this purpose, a second one was gradually formed to supply the defects of the first. The Masoretic punctuation being founded on the older vocalization of the text, retains nearly all the errors of that vocalization, and has superadded some of its own: but the latter class of faults the system itself supplies the means of correcting; and—what is of immense importance to the Hebrew student—it has preserved and transmitted to us the inflection of their words, and through them, the grammatic structure of the ancient language, etc.

“ In the fifth place, provision was made from the commencement of this evil (the perversion of prophecies by the Jews) for its eventual removal, through the manifestation of the adventitious nature of the *matres lectionis*; by means of which exposure we are enabled to treat the use made of them in the Hebrew Scriptures as an uninspired work, and retain only the good parts of it, separated and purified from the bad, etc.”

Any one acquainted with Hebrew literature will gather from these positions what Dr. Wall contemplates, and for those who have not that acquaintance, no extracts, however long, would sufficiently explain

his object. We more than doubt whether this Jewish perversion of the Hebrew Bible is a fact; and even were it conceded, we cannot grant that we have in our hands any effectual remedy. However, those who are competent to form a judgment on such matters, and take an interest in them, will consult the work for themselves. It is divided into six chapters, the principal of which "discuss the proofs of the spuriousness of the *matres lectionis* derived from the uses made of them in Hebrew words, and from the uses made of them in the structure of the language." Of course, if Dr. Wall's theory is admissible, and the Hebrew text can receive any undoubted corrections, the revision of our Authorised Version must be founded on it. But as we doubt the premises we reject the conclusion. We repeat, however, that the amount of learned matter in the volume gives it a high value, apart from the object it aims at, and may succeed or fail in attaining.

-
1. *Inscription of Tiglath Pileser I., King of Assyria*, B. C. 1150. As translated by SIR HENRY RAWLINSON, FOX TALBOT, ESQ., DR. HINCKS, and DR. OPPERT. Published by the Royal Asiatic Society. London: J. W. Parker and Son. 1857. 8vo. pp. 73.
 2. *The Prophecies relating to Nineveh and the Assyrians. Translated from the Hebrew with Historical Introduction and Notes, exhibiting the principal results of the recent discoveries.* By GEORGE VANCE SMITH, B.A. London: Longmans. 1857. 12mo. pp. 310.

IN the intelligence department of our last number we gave a full account of the experiment of which the first of these works is the result. The pamphlet gives the opinions of Dean Milman, Mr. G. Grote, Sir Gardner Wilkinson, and Professor H. H. Wilson, which are substantially the same, and as that of Professor Wilson is more full, we present it to our readers:—

"Of the four translations submitted, those of Mr. Fox Talbot and Sir Henry Rawlinson are entire; that of Dr. Hincks comprises twenty-eight of the fifty-four paragraphs into which the inscription may be divided, the copy in his possession having been received rather too late to allow of a more extended version. Dr. Oppert's contains twenty-one paragraphs, being translated from an imperfect copy, taken by himself from a single cylinder, and that, apparently, defective. In both instances, however, although the translation of the whole has not been effected, yet there is quite enough to enable a conclusion to be drawn as to the amount of agreement or disagreement between the several translators, and the result is, upon the whole, a very remarkable coincidence.

"That they are all agreed, or very nearly so, as to the powers of the characters, is established by their concurrent readings of proper names, which they almost always express in as nearly the same manner as can be expected, when we consider the different values attached by different persons to the letters of our own alphabet. There is a remarkable instance of this in the readings of three of the translators (Hincks has not given the passage) of a series of thirty-nine names of countries, in paragraph XXI. They are all rendered by Sir Henry Rawlinson, Mr. Talbot, and Dr. Oppert in the same manner exactly, with one or two doubtful exceptions,—as, Elama, Amadana, Shiribili, and so forth: at the same time, however, it is to be observed, that this agreement is no doubt, in part at least, owing to their adoption of the values proposed previously by Sir H. Rawlinson and Dr. Hincks.

"The agreement as regards the letters being established, it follows that significant terms will be also similarly read; and this may be assumed to be the case from the frequent correspondence in the passages of the translations. It may be stated generally, that, with a few exceptions, the main purport of each paragraph agrees. In some instances the verbal expression of that purport is as close as can be reasonably expected from different translators, who may very safely express the same meaning in a somewhat different form of words; but, in others, it differs. The translators often admit that a particular passage is obscure; and it is obvious that the value of many common words has yet to be determined. As, for instance, where Tiglath Pileser enumerates his exploits as a mighty hunter, Rawlinson makes his game 'wild buffaloes'; Talbot retains the original word, *amsi*; and Hincks makes them 'wild elephants.' In the general sense of either killing or taking alive wild animals of some description or other, they are agreed. A fair example of agreement and disagreement will be found in the several translations of paragraphs LII. and LIII., in which imprecations are denounced upon any future princes who may in any way deface the records or tablets or cylinders of Tiglath Pileser.

"Upon the whole, the result of this experiment—than which a fairer test could scarcely be devised—may be considered as establishing, almost definitively, the correctness of the valuation of the *characters* of these inscriptions. It is possible that further investigations may find something to alter or to add; but the great portion, if not the whole, may be read with confidence. It is somewhat different with respect to the words of the language. The almost invariable concurrence of the translators in the general sense of the several paragraphs, shews that they are agreed to give the same interpretation to a very considerable portion—if not the larger portion—of the vocabulary. At the same time the differences prove that much remains to be effected before the sense of every term can be confidently rendered. Where so much, however, has been accomplished, under such extraordinary difficulties, there is every reason to hope that the uncertainties which remain will be ultimately overcome."

A specimen of the four renderings will properly follow Professor Wilson's estimate:—

"XLVII. (viii. 1.)

RAWLINSON.

"Bit-Khamri, the temple of my lord Vul, which Shansi-Vul, high-priest of Ashur, son of Ismi-Dagan, high-priest of Ashur, had founded, became ruined. I levelled its site, and from its foundation to its roofs I built it up of brick, I enlarged it beyond its former state, and I adorned it. Inside of it I sacrificed precious victims to my lord Vul.

TALBOT.

"The temple of Kamri, of YEM, my lord, which Shemsi-Yem, supreme lord of Assyria, son of Ishmi-Dagon, supreme lord of Assyria likewise, in former days constructed, had fallen to decay. Newly I levelled its site, and from its foundations to its roof I rebuilt it with masonry of brick. More than formerly I *enlarged* (?), and I constructed it; and within it costly victims unto Yem my lord, I sacrificed.

HINCKS.

"The *banqueting-house* of Iv, my lord, which Samsi-Iv, champion of Assur, son of Ismi-dagan, champion of Assur, and so forth, had built, was decayed and destroyed. I cleaned out its site. I built it with burned bricks from the foundation to the coping. I put it in its former state, and *began to use* it. I offered within it excellent sacrifices to Iv, my lord.

OPPERT.

"The Bit-hamr of Ao, which Shamshi Ao, sovereign of Assyria, son of Ismi-dagan, sovereign of Assyria, had built. . . . Its place I surveyed (?) From its foundations until its covering I made a brickwork, on the ditches. . . . In the middle I consecrated high altars to my lord Ao."

This experiment is thus so far satisfactory that it proves that the translation of the Assyrian inscriptions is proceeding on a scientific basis; and that the remaining obstacles are only such as time and perseverance may be expected to remove. But there is still so much uncertainty about the historical results of this recent investigation of the disintombed monuments of a very remote age, that any attempt to fix their application to the Holy Scripture may be waived as premature. Mr. Smith partly admits this by saying in his preface:—

“In the present state of the decipherment of the monuments a number of topics can only be treated conjecturally; and in all probability as a better knowledge of the inscriptions is gained, some things now adopted, or offered for acceptance, will be withdrawn or considerably modified. Meanwhile, I have availed myself, as best I could, and not without the fear of having sometimes gone astray, of the light which has been thrown on these subjects, during the last few years, by the discoveries and investigations of Sir H. C. Rawlinson, Mr. Layard, and Dr. Hincks. The time, it is evident, is not yet come for attempting to write, definitely, the history of the Assyrians.”

Agreeing in this view, we cannot but think that the attempt should be deferred of applying matter as yet uncertain to the explanation of Holy Scripture; and while Mr. Smith has conferred much interest on the subject he discusses, his work rather indulges than discourages the modern tendency to over-elucidate the ancient documents of the Bible. We are sorry to have to add that Mr. Smith's exegetical principles are rather latitudinarian, as will appear from the following passages, on Isaiah vii. 14:—

“The sign is, in this case, a child yet to be born, whose name, now proclaimed (God with us) shall be a record of the promise of deliverance. *The virgin*: the article points to some definite person known to the speaker and to the king; indeed, it must have been so for the prophecy to carry with it any intelligible ground of confidence or certainty; for otherwise how could its fulfilment be recognized? We have no means of determining, however, *who* exactly may have been within the prophet's view. The word has been variously understood. We need only mention here that it has been taken to denote (1) Isaiah's wife, the mother of Shear-jashub; (2) a betrothed, or recently-married, second wife of the prophet. In either case the expected child will be another son of Isaiah, with a significant name (comp. viii. 1—4); and will become by his name a *sign* of the approaching deliverance. The word has been explained (3) of the wife of Ahaz herself; and (4) in a twofold sense, of some person then present, and typical of the mother of the Messiah. This last is substantially Bishop Lowth's interpretation; and so most other interpreters. According to this view, the child Immanuel is the Messiah. But it must be observed that Isaiah, wishing to encourage Ahaz, is evidently speaking of a deliverance shortly to be wrought—a deliverance from the enemy then present in the land, or soon to be so—and cannot well be supposed to be referring to any remote descendant of the line of David, to be born long afterwards. The prophecy is indeed cited by St. Matthew, nearly in the words of the Septuagint version, and applied by him to the birth of Christ (Matt. i. 23). The words had probably come to be understood in the Messianic sense by the later Jews, and hence the use made of them by the Evangelist and the early Christian Church. This application is defended by Lowth, on the ground that the verse contains ‘a higher secondary sense,’ distinctly intended by the Prophet, besides the literal or historical one arising out of the circumstances of the times. Isaiah does not, however, *tell us* anything of this higher sense; and so the reader is, of course, left at liberty to judge for himself how far it is here admissible. . . . *Hath conceived*: the original word is a verbal adjective, without any proper mark of *time*.”

A Manual of Church History. By HENRY E. F. GUERICKE, Doctor and Professor of Theology in Halle. Translated from the German by WILLIAM G. T. SHEDD, Brown Professor in Andover Theological Seminary. Ancient Church History; comprising the first Six Centuries. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1857. 8vo. pp. 438.

THE established credit of Guericke's labours in the department of ecclesiastical history, and the use made of his works by many English writers, will make this volume acceptable to a very large class of students and readers. Its popularity in Germany is thus described by the translator:—

“Guericke's *Manual of Church History*, of which the first division is now presented to the public in an English version, has passed through eight editions in Germany. The work was first published in 1833, and the last volume of the eighth edition appeared in 1855. The demand for so many re-issues of this hand-book within the space of a little more than twenty years, in a country distinguished for the fecundity of its authorship and the fastidiousness of its scholarship, affords strong presumptive evidence of its intrinsic merits. During the last twenty-five years the German mind has been remarkably active in the department of ecclesiastical history, and the growth of German literature in this direction has been luxuriant; and yet the Manual of Guericke continues to hold a place certainly among the very first, as a book for students and lecture rooms.”

This testimony is highly gratifying, from the consideration that Guericke is thoroughly orthodox, and we cannot but rejoice in the good effects which the use of a volume so reverential and conservative must have had upon the German mind, so disposed to get out to sea in theological speculation. The same qualities enable us to welcome the work in an English dress; and a perusal of large portions of it has assured us of the entire truth of the estimate given by Mr. Shedd of its value. He tells us that the author is in hearty sympathy with the truths of Revelation as they are enunciated in the ancient creeds of Christendom, and embodied in the experience of the Church from the earliest times. Mr. Shedd properly says that “such a living interest in the evangelical substance of Christianity, and such an intelligent and thorough reception of it into his own personal experience, can alone prepare the historian of the Christian Church to enter vividly into its whole varied career.” Our readers will at once see the importance of a trustworthy history of which the following characteristics can be predicated:—

“The writer of this history beholds in Jesus Christ the incarnation of Deity itself for the redemption of the world, and stands upon the high ground of supernaturalism in reference to the origin, establishment, and perpetuity of the Christian religion. There is no equivocation or ambiguity in his use of these terms, or in his explanation of these and cognate doctrines. The student of this Manual, whatever else he may find or not find, will certainly find himself, so far as he follows the leadings of this investigation, in the very heart of the decided and frank orthodoxy of all unambiguous periods, and of all thoroughly sincere minds.”

The other qualities indicated by the translator are these:—the high estimate formed of the internal history of the Church; accuracy and learning; the taking the proper medium between the full and flowing

narrative of history proper, and the mere meagre synopsis or epitome. We hope the publishers in this country will be repaid for their enterprise in giving us so cheap and handsome an edition of a work which is worthy of all these commendations.

Paramésvara-jnyána-góshthí. A Dialogue of the Knowledge of the Supreme Lord; in which are compared the Claims of Christianity and Hinduism, and various Questions of Indian Religion and Literature fairly discussed. Cambridge: Deighton, Bell, and Co. London: Bell and Daldy. 1856. 8vo. pp. 566.

IN the number of this Journal for January, 1857, the Rev. Rowland Williams (now D.D.), acknowledged himself to be the author of the volume before us, and gave an account of its design. By referring to that number, our readers will find a fair and full estimate of what is to be expected from the work, and we have now only to add a few critical remarks, which the author could not be expected to make on his own production. It is not too much to say, that Dr. Williams has presented to the English reader a more clear account of the principles of the Hindu theology than has ever before appeared in this country. He has *studied* the subject; which is more than writers of travels or even missionaries stationed in India often do. We generally get accounts of heathen religions through the channels of prejudice, which refuse to acknowledge that anything good can be mingled with the errors and superstitions of Paganism. Dr. Williams followed a more candid course, and has thus been able to present what is thoughtful and philosophic in the great religious system of India to the notice of his countrymen. Not only does this of itself confer a great value on this volume, it also enables the writer to compare Christianity and Hinduism more certainly and positively than he could have done, had he merely taken the one-sided view of the latter, which is too often done.

But this work will be more generally estimated by the opinions on Christianity, and its allied topics, for which it furnishes the occasion. Dr. Williams is an avowed sceptic as to the truth of some settled dogmas of the Christian Church, which are generally denominated *orthodox*, and advocates a more free investigation and exposition of Scripture doctrines than are common in the Church of England. With great acuteness, and much learning, he embodies this unfettered method of exegesis in the dialogues which compose this volume. On the points in dispute between him and the orthodox interpreters of the documents of our faith, we will not now enter; the theme is too large and too important for a short notice only, such as we can now give to the subject. We will only add, that with all our respect for the abilities of the writer, we cannot follow him in his opinion, that the advanced intellectual activity of our own age can legitimately be allowed to alter or neutralize the religious convictions of all past ages, which, amidst many errors and much inconsistency, yet embody in a certain and defensible symbolism the great articles of the Christian faith.

The Book of the Prophet Isaiah, translated from the original Hebrew ; with a Commentary, critical, philological, and exegetical. To which is prefixed an introductory Dissertation on the Life and Times of the Prophet, the Character of his Style, the Authenticity and Integrity of his Book, and the Principles of Prophetical Interpretation. By the Rev. E. HENDERSON, D.D., Author of "Lectures on Divine Inspiration," etc., etc. Second Edition. London: Hamilton and Co. 1857. 8vo. pp. 520.

WE are glad, on two accounts, to have to present to our readers a new edition of Dr. Henderson on Isaiah; *first*, because the fact is an indication that the exegetical study of the Old Testament goes on in England; *secondly*, because we feel it a pleasing duty to do all honour to the school of native Biblical criticism and interpretation, which has been often unjustly disparaged in comparison with the schools of foreign growth. There is a solid good sense in the character of the English mind which makes its productions more safe than those of our continental neighbours; provided, only, that the results of the learned researches of the latter are not despised or disregarded, but carefully laid under contribution for our benefit. That Dr. Henderson sees the importance of combining the labours of all scholars with his own, will appear by the following extract from his Preface:—

"While, in this country, our prophet has been comparatively neglected, the critics of Germany have subjected his book to rigid processes of philological and exegetical investigation. The *Scholia* of the younger Rosenmüller, and the commentaries of Gesenius, Hitzig, and Hendewerk, though lamentably abounding with infidel sentiments, far surpass anything of the kind hitherto published, viewed as works of pure criticism and sources of appeal for successful interpretation. This remark applies especially to the two first;—to Rosenmüller, on account of the copiousness with which he exhibits the views of ancient and modern writers, and the acumen which he generally displays in arriving at his conclusions; and to Gesenius, on account of his accurate knowledge of etymological and syntactical niceties of the Hebrew language, his judicious use of the cognate dialects, his profound historical and geographical research, and his careful investigation of the difficulties which lay in his path."

In reference to this second edition, the author says that, "the work, as a whole, remains substantially the same, though it contains a few additions derived from more modern research, and such slight alterations as I have deemed absolutely needful." This, we think, is satisfactory; though some of our contemporaries have complained that Dr. Henderson has not made more use of the recent Assyrian discoveries. But there is great danger in being too hasty in disturbing current opinions on Biblical subjects by every new discovery. Not until such novelties have attained some scientific certainty should they be exalted to the place of aids to Biblical exegesis; and the writer of a commentary, who avails himself of the results of modern activity, whether in philology or antiquities, with precipitation, will not only sometimes do harm to the truth, but also be compelled, with shame, to retrace his steps.

We consider Dr. Henderson's works on the Holy Scriptures, now

extending over the whole of the Prophets, as forming a noble monument of his piety and erudition, and we commend them to the notice of such of our readers as are not yet acquainted with them.

Analecta Nicæna: Fragments relating to the Council of Nice. The Syriac Text from an ancient MS. in the British Museum. With a Translation, Notes, etc. By B. HARRIS COWPER. London: Williams and Norgate. 1857. 4to. pp. 42.

MR. COWPER has devoted much time and labour to the study of the Syriac language, some fruits of which have appeared in our pages. He is now editing a Syriac Grammar in English, founded on that of Dr. Hoffman, with additions and exercises; and we feel sure that his long-continued researches among the Syriac MSS. in the British Museum have added to his competency for such a task. The work before us is lithographed from the author's copy of the MS., portions of which are here printed for the first time. The "Fragments" are twelve in number:—1. A letter of Constantine, summoning the Bishops from Ancyra to Nice. This has long been regarded as lost, and is affirmed actually to be so by Hefele, in his *Conciliengeschichte*.—2. The Decree of Constantine against the Arians.—3. The Nicene Creed.—4. The Creed of Constantinople.—5. The names of the Bishops who subscribed the Nicene Creed.—6. Title of the Nicæan Canons.—7. The Colophon of a Book of the Canons.—8, 9. Two fragments referring to the Council of Nice.—10 and 11. Canons VI. and VIII. of the Council of Nice.—12. The subscription to the letter from the Bishop of Rome to the Bishop of Constantinople, written in A.D. 452, or less than fifty years before the date of the Syriac MS.

It will be at once seen that considerable interest attaches to these Fragments, and the notes and illustrations of Mr. Cowper much enhance their value.

A Manual of the whole Scripture History, and of the History of the Jews, between the periods of the Old and New Testaments: including Notices of Biblical Antiquities and Geography, Oriental Manners and Customs, Historical Parallels and Contemporary Events, the Structure and Import of the Jewish Ritual, and a Survey of the Nature and Design of the successive Dispensations, Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian. With Questions for Examination. For the use of Schools and Families. By the Rev. J. E. RIDDLE, M.A., Incumbent of St. Philip's, Leckhampton. London: Longman and Co. 1857. 18mo. pp. 464.

THIS book belongs to a class of works demanding great labour, and of the very highest value to students of the Scriptures, which yet procure for their authors only the credit of careful compilation. Men like Mr. Riddle are true benefactors to their generation, in being thus willing to labour in a good cause, and to find their reward in doing

good. The long title we have quoted gives a pretty fair idea of the contents of the book, which shews extensive knowledge of Biblical subjects, and great discrimination in selecting them and grouping them together. Having taken the pains to look carefully through the volume, we are able to bear testimony that it is well able to carry out the purposes for which the author designed it. Mr. Riddle says, "My chief aim has been to provide a Manual for the use of our middle and higher schools; but I trust that the design and contents of this history will be found to include also much that may commend it to the attention of students in our universities, candidates for sacred ministry, and other intelligent readers. I may add, that the construction of the book renders it available for use either as a Class Reading Book, as a Book of Exercises, as a Manual for superintendents of Bible classes, and other Biblical teachers, or as a work for private perusal."

The Sabbath made for Man; or, the Origin, History, and Principles of the Lord's Day. By the Rev. MICAH HILL. London: Shaw. 1857. 12mo. pp. 532.

THIS work obtained a prize, out of many competitors, offered by the Evangelical Alliance. It will be found to advocate opinions on the Sabbath nearly the same as those fully defended in our present number. The divisions are as follows:—"God and the Sabbath, Moses and the Sabbath, Christ and the Sabbath, the Apostles and the Sabbath, Christianity and the Sabbath, Morality and the Sabbath, the Physiology of the Sabbath, Hallowing the Lord's-day, Historical Survey of the Sabbath, Sabbath Observances and Sunday Desecration in Europe and America."

-
1. *The New Testament Translated.* Part the First: The Gospel by St. Matthew; the Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. T. S. GREEN, M.A. London: Bagsters. 1857. 8vo. pp. 100.
 2. *The English Bible, and our Duty with regard to it.* With an Appendix, containing a Concordance of the most important terms in the New Testament, compared with the original Greek, adapted to the English reader. By PHILALETHES. Dublin: Mc Glashan and Gill. 1857. 8vo. pp. 50.
 3. *Revised English Version of the Holy Scriptures, by the American Bible Union.* I. and II. Thessalonians, p. 49 to end. London: Trübner. 1857. 4to.

THREE more publications called forth by the present movement regarding the revision of the English Bible. Mr. Green is well known as a Biblical scholar, and his emendations ought to have some weight. But he has given no reason for his changes, except in a very few instances; and this will, we fear, make the work less interesting to most readers. Philalethes writes sensibly, and contributes some materials for the

settlement of the question he discusses. On the labours of the American Bible Union we have more than once expressed an opinion, and given our readers opportunities of judging for themselves.

The Paragraph Bible in separate Books, with Marginal Renderings, Introductions, Alphabetical Indices, and numerous Maps. Complete in Four Volumes. London: Bagsters. 12mo.

THIS edition of the Holy Scriptures is now complete, and we embrace the opportunity of speaking in praise of the whole work, as we have done more than once of the separate parts. The type is large and clear, the paper good, and the whole execution leaves nothing to be desired. Nothing critical and nothing novel is to be looked for in this edition of the Bible, as far as the contents are concerned; but the shape in which it has been brought out will tend, we feel sure, to make it highly useful. For the sick bed the separate portions are invaluable. Messrs. Bagster will not increase their fame as publishers of learned works by these volumes, but they will do more—they will, in an humble and unostentatious manner, administer the bread of life to thousands of the members of Christ's flock.

An Analytical Index to the Four Gospels and the Acts of the Apostles, designed to facilitate the study of those books. By WILLIAM STROUD, M.D. London: Judd and Glass. 1857. 12mo. pp. 80.

THE labours of Dr. Stroud on the Greek text of the New Testament were proved to be abundant and practical, by the publication of *A Harmony of the Four Gospels in Greek*. This circumstance necessarily disposes us to attach a value to the little work before us, which, although small, is the result of much close study of the evangelists. What is designed by the author we will allow him to explain in his own words:—

“The following *Analytical Index to the Four Gospels* comprehends the whole of their contents, divided, according to the nature of the subject, into parts, sections, and paragraphs; and arranged, as far as can be ascertained, in the order of time. That order is very generally observed by the evangelists themselves, except in the middle portions of the gospels of St. Matthew and St. Luke, where, for the purpose of restoring it, much transposition conducted on strict principles has been practised, with great advantage to the connection and perspicuity of the narrative, and without any disparagement to the sacred writers, who doubtless had good reasons for the more devious course which they pursued. Each portion of the Index is headed by a short description, and a reference to its source, whether in one or more gospels; but, in order to avoid undue prolixity, the ultimate analysis of a good many of the paragraphs is left to be completed by the reader. More than half the united text of the four gospels consists of peculiarities, or passages furnished by a single evangelist, and the remainder of concordances, or passages common to two or more evangelists; and in the synopsis here presented, these two classes of passages are to a considerable extent distinguished. The several gospels differ much in this respect; St. John's gospel consisting almost entirely of peculiarities, and St. Mark's of concordances. In the two other gospels these constituents are more equally divided;

the peculiarities, however, predominating in St. Luke, and the concordances in St. Matthew. Supposing the whole amount of each gospel to be expressed by the number 100, the proportion of peculiarities in St. John's gospel would be denoted by 92, in St. Luke's by 59, in St. Matthew's by 42, and in St. Mark's by 7; the remainders from 100 representing, of course, their respective concordances. These details serve to confirm the explanations previously offered respecting the origin of the four gospels, and to furnish satisfactory reasons for their number, the order of their publication, the character of their contents and omissions, and the extent of their resemblances and diversities; circumstances which, without such explanations, are apt to perplex the conscientious student of the New Testament, and to strengthen the objections of the sceptic."

Modern Anglican Theology: chapters on Coleridge, Hare, Maurice, Kingsley, and Jowett, and on the Nature of the Atonement. By the Rev. JAMES RIGG. London: Heylin. 1857. 12mo. pp. 404.

SOME of the chapters of this volume have appeared as essays in the *London Quarterly Review*, where they were considered to be productions above *par*, both as to information, and the taste and style of the author. Mr. Rigg belongs to the Wesleyan denomination, and this fact rather incapacitates him for taking the most enlarged views of the Church of England, whose theological writers he subjects to a keen criticism. The great fault found by Wesleyans with Southey's *Life of Wesley* was, that he was too much outside the community founded by the subject of his biography to do justice to its aims and motives. The same may be said of Mr. Rigg in relation to the Church of England; his stand-point giving him only partial glimpses and disproportionate measurements of some of the topics he writes upon. With this exception, his volume is highly interesting. He has published a most readable book, conveying solid matter for reflection in a pleasing style.

Life in Israel; or, Portraits of Hebrew Character. By MARIA T. RICHARDS, author of *Life in Judæa*. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1857. 12mo. pp. 382.

THE accomplished authoress of this beautiful volume endeavours to give interest to the narrations of the Old Testament, by uniting their scattered portion with a web of fiction. The tales are highly interesting, and young persons will have the localities, persons, and events of Bible history more deeply fixed in their memory, if they read this volume with that object in view. There is some danger, however, as in the case of all historical novels, of the fiction occupying the whole field of vision, to the neglect of the real and true.

The Book of Jonah: illustrated by Discoveries at Nineveh. By the Rev. P. S. DESPREZ, B.D. London: Judd and Glass, 1857. 18mo. pp. 133.

In this little work, Mr. Desprez has taken some pains to present in a popular form the results of the discoveries at Nineveh, so far as they

throw light upon the Biblical narrative relating to it contained in the Book of Jonah. The volume contains the substance of four lectures, delivered, it appears, to the author's own congregation. Too high a value seems to be assigned, in our opinion, to the discoveries, as affording confirmation of the statements of holy writ; and we can hardly understand in what respects the facts brought to light can be said to be "sufficiently powerful to paralyse infidelity, and to demonstrate the veracity of Revelation." Notwithstanding, however, this undue appreciation of the evidence afforded by the exhumed city, Mr. Desprez has succeeded in producing a highly interesting and instructive little book, which we can cordially recommend to the perusal of those who are unable to avail themselves of more extensive and elaborate publications on the subject. As a specimen, take the following, with respect to the ready credence afforded by the Ninevites to the Prophet's message :—

"The clue may, perhaps, be found by a comparison of the scriptural statement with the recent discoveries. It is altogether improbable, that the circumstances of Jonah's miraculous preservation could have been unknown to the people of Nineveh. The sailors of the vessel had possibly been there before him to spread the news of the miracle they had witnessed; neither have we any reason to suppose that the prophet himself would have concealed the fact. Now it is not unworthy of notice, in connexion with his successful mission, that among Assyrian objects of worship the fish-gods held a conspicuous place. These deities, plentifully depicted on the tablets, are thus described by Mr. Layard :—'Within the temple, at right angles to the entrance, were sculptured fish-gods; the fish's head formed part of the three-horned cap usually worn by the winged figures; the tail only reached to the waist of the man.' . . . According to Berosus, 'There appeared out of the Erythræan, or Persian Gulf, an animal endowed with reason, called Oannes. Its body was like that of a fish, but under the head of a fish was that of a man, and added to its tail were women's feet; its voice, too, was human, and it spoke an articulate language; during the day it instructed the Chaldeans in the arts and sciences, teaching them to build temples, but at night it plunged again into the sea.' These fish-gods were objects of worship not only amongst the Assyrians, but the Philistines. Dagon, before whose image the ark of the Lord was brought, was a deity of this kind. . . . All this throws light upon the reception Jonah met with at Nineveh. It is not improbable that these blind idolators believed him to be in communication with the gods whom they worshipped. Thus his very shame was turned into his exaltation, and his disobedience into the cause of his wonderful success."

The author has made good use of the remarkable poem of *Ephraem Syrus*, "The Repentance of Nineveh," recently translated from the Syriac by the Editor of this Journal.

Vita della Beata Vergine Maria, Madre del nostro Signore Gesù Cristo, estratta dal Nuovo Testamento e raccontata nelle medesime Parole della Sacra Scrittura. Con una breve Introduzione del Revdo. ENRICO W. TIBBS, M.A., Membro dell'Accademia Reale Irlandese; Curato della Parrocchia di Oxton nella Diocesi di Lincoln. Londra: Stampata da Giuseppe Enrico Batty; J. H. Parker, 337 Strand.

THIS is a publication of the Society for making known on the Continent the principles of the Church of England. All the information con-

tained in the New Testament respecting the Virgin is given in a lucid manner, and we think the Tract is adapted to be useful if circulated extensively among Roman Catholics. There is nothing of the offensive depreciation of the Church of Rome, the end being sought rather by plain dogmatic statement than by controversial opposition.

Cyclopædia Bibliographica: a Library Manual of Theological and General Literature, and Guide to Books for Authors, Preachers, Students, and Literary Men. Analytical, Bibliographical, and Biographical. By JAMES DARLING. SUBJECTS. London: Darling. 1857. Part I. Imperial 8vo.

WE are glad to find that Mr. Darling has really grappled with this second division of his almost Herculean labour. We have found so much benefit from the former work, giving an alphabetical list of *authors*, that we look forward with much pleasure to the completion of the dictionary of *subjects*. There is one thing which we wish could be avoided, namely, the mixing up so much that is quite ephemeral with what may be presumed to be permanently valuable. For instance, under the name of Dr. Cumming, in the former volume, we have nearly two columns devoted to the separate sermons of that voluminous author; few of which, we may be sure, will be of any interest to the next generation. Surely, a notice of the titles of his volumes would have been amply sufficient. The following is Mr. Darling's exhibition of his design; and we hope to refer to it again and again as it makes progress:—

“The work will be entirely uniform with the *Cyclopædia Bibliographica—Authors*, recently published, and to which it will form a necessary sequel. Both volumes will be mutually connected and illustrative of each other: the one, under an alphabetical list of authors, exhibiting the *Subjects* on which they have written by an analytical list of their works, with some account of their lives; and the other (that now about to be published), under a scientific arrangement of heads or common places, pointing out the *Authors* who have written on each subject. By this method, and also by a distinct alphabetical arrangement of subjects, a ready reference will be obtained to books, treatises, sermons, and dissertations—whether published as distinct works, or forming parts of volumes and collected works—on nearly all heads of divinity; the books, chapters, and verses of Scripture; doctrinal, practical, and polemical divinity; and useful topics in literature, philosophy, and history, on a more complete system than has yet been attempted in any language; forming an index to the contents of libraries, both public and private, and a cyclopædia of the sources of information and discussion in theology, as well as in most branches of knowledge.”

INTELLIGENCE,

BIBLICAL, EDUCATIONAL, LITERARY, AND MISCELLANEOUS.

THE SCRIPTURAL LAW OF MARRIAGE AND DIVORCE.

FROM the mass of materials lately presented to our notice on this subject we select the following, from the *Quarterly Review* for July last. We do this the more willingly because it states the arguments on the side of the question less generally received.—ED. J. S. L.

And we will begin by constructing in good faith the argument from Holy Scripture, as we conceive it may best be stated on behalf of the bill.

In two places of St. Matthew's gospel, our Lord adverts to the subject of marriage and divorce, and contrasts either the Mosaic system or the prevailing practice of the time with that he was about to establish. The first allusion is spontaneous, in the Sermon on the Mount. The second is drawn from him by the invidious question of the Pharisees. In the first he says,—

"I say unto you, that whosoever shall put away (*ἀπολύσῃ*) his wife, saving for the cause of fornication (*παρέκτος λόγου πορνείας*), causeth her to commit adultery; and whosoever shall marry her that is divorced (*ὅς ἔαν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ*) committeth adultery" (Matt. v. 32).

In the second passage the words are as follows:—

"Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives; but from the beginning it was not so.

"And I say unto you, whosoever shall put away (*ἀπολύσῃ*) his wife, except it be for fornication (*εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, according to the reading followed in our translation), and shall marry another, committeth adultery; and whoso marrieth her which is put away (*ὃ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας*) doth commit adultery" (Matt. xix. 8, 9).

As our Lord puts his own precept in contrast with a system which had become one of unlimited licence, the general scope of this discourse does not require us to construe it of the extinction, but only of the limitation of divorce.

Accordingly, while laying it down as a general rule, firstly, that divorce is sinful, and secondly, that the re-marriage of a divorced person involves the sin of adultery, our Saviour makes an apparent exception to the first precept, expressed by our translation in the words "saving for the cause of fornication."

Thus far the ground is firm; but now follow a slippery series of assumptions, where difficulty rises upon difficulty like Alp on Alp.

1. It is assumed that the clause of exception, which in both cases is found in the first member of the passage, runs through and governs the whole of it, so that, wherever putting away is authorized, re-marriage is also permitted.

2. It is assumed that the word translated "fornication" means adultery.

3. It is assumed that the last member of each of the two passages refers not to all women put away by their husbands, but only to certain women, i. e., those put away otherwise than for adultery.

4. It is assumed that the whole or some part of the liberty of putting away for adultery, and of re-marriage thereupon, thus given to the husband, may likewise be claimed for the wife.

5. It is assumed that the statement of St. Matthew, as being more full, ought to import the exception into the gospels of St. Mark and St. Luke, both of whom render the prohibition of re-marriage absolutely; and into the argument of St. Paul, who tells the Romans (Rom. vii. 1—3), simply that marriage is for life, and that a woman re-marrying is an adulteress; and who tells the Corinthians (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11), that a man must not dismiss his wife, and a woman must

not leave her husband, but that if she does leave him she must remain unmarried.

6. After all these passages of Scripture have been thus distended, by forcing into them the exception fetched from St. Matthew, that exception is itself by some persons put under a similar process, to introduce the case of desertion as a second justifying cause for divorce and re-marriage. And inasmuch as St. Paul has declared that a Christian husband or wife married to an unbeliever is to suffer the unbelieving yokemate to depart if so minded, it is assumed that this constitutes a licence among married Christians for a husband or a wife when deserted to obtain a divorce *a vinculo*, and to re-marry.

Such is the Scripture argument for divorce, and, with the exception of the case of desertion, which is not included in the present proposal, such is the Scripture argument for the bill; and in these circumstances it is, that any one who feels somewhat choked by this gigantic mass of assumptions is told by a Chief Justice that he is quibbling, and that any one whose back groans under the burden of them, is comforted by a Postmaster-General with the assurance that he requires no help at all.

The amount of licence in the interpretation of Scripture which is involved in the first five propositions above stated is absolutely indispensable in order to sustain the Christian character of the Divorce Bill. Yet on the face of them they are such as when simply brought together must startle, so at least we think, the understanding and the conscience of those who have supported this bill under the strange, but we believe actually prevalent, idea that they are bringing back our law to the standard of the Divine Word. When the case has been further stated with regard to them, we think it will appear that they are such as go far towards that most wretched consummation which reduces all exegesis to a profane and deluding art, with no other business than to frame contrivances under which we may hug the supposition that we are obeying God, when in truth we are denying his laws.

It will be observed that the whole force of the so-called Scripture argument for divorces with re-marriage rests, first, upon an assumed sense of St. Matthew; next, an assumed opposition between St. Matthew and other parts of Scripture; then, an accommodation in each case of the narrower and straighter to the more relaxed declaration; and lastly, a further accommodation of the relaxed declaration itself to the notions with which we have pre-determined that it shall square. St. Matthew, let us suppose, gives divorce for adultery. St. Mark, St. Luke, St. Paul, where they are narrower, must yield to St. Matthew, who is wider; St. Matthew must then be widened to admit St. Paul; and then by a great and last effort the whole of them, seeing that they do not contain one word on behalf of re-marriage, must be carried forward to this necessary point by the assumption that power to put away includes power to choose anew, and that liberty to suffer desertion without following the deserter, includes liberty to bring in some one to supply his place.

Accustomed as we are personally and by tradition to conceive of the sacred writings only as collected into a whole, we have need, in order to arrive at right conditions of judgment for the question before us, to go back to the period when they were respectively composed. It is not difficult, when in one part of a volume we find a doctrine laid down without exception, to bear in mind another part of the same volume where an exception is specified, and to construe the separate passages as one, by making the more general submit to the more detailed. But the case assumes a very different aspect when we bear in mind that the three gospels in question are proved, from internal evidence, to have been written separately for different descriptions of persons, and that those who were acquainted with the one remained, in all likelihood for no inconsiderable time, unacquainted with the others. St. Matthew^a wrote for the Jewish Christians, and probably in Hebrew; St. Mark probably for the Gentiles at Rome, or, as

^a Bishop Tomline's *Elements*, part ii., chap. ii., iii., iv.; Davies Morgan, *Doctrine*, etc., vol. ii., 102.

some think, for the converts from among the foreign Jews or Hellenists ; St. Luke for the Gentiles, and probably for those of Greece. We have no title to say that these evangelists were respectively acquainted with each other's works. And it would indeed be strange, were it true, that the doctrine of divorce should be so positively delivered by each of them, and yet in terms which were irreconcilable. For what was the condition, previously to the formation of the Canon, of those who had only the gospel of St. Mark or St. Luke, or even of those who, while acquainted with both these Gentile gospels, knew nothing of the Hebrew gospel of the Jews ? We are, of course, open to the reply that a difference is undeniable between the language of St. Matthew on the one hand, and that of St. Mark and St. Luke on the other. But the question is, what is the nature of that difference ? Is it a difference which affects universally the structure of the Christian law of marriage, as the adversary contends ? If so, it is strange and painfully difficult to account for. Or is it, on the other hand, a difference not affecting the Christian law of marriage at all, but having reference to circumstances that do not touch the validity of the contract, or that were peculiar to the Jewish polity, and fugitive, like that polity ? If so, then, as taken in connexion with what we know from other sources of the purposes of these gospels respectively, the difference, so far from constituting a flaw in the composition of the Holy Scripture, is in admirable accordance with its purpose, and contributes to its perfection.

And here it is time for us to remark, that, as regards the essential point in the whole dispute, that of freedom to re-marry, the opposition between the three gospels, on which so formidable a fabric has been reared, does not in reality exist at all. It is not St. Matthew, but it is the expositors of St. Matthew, who place him in conflict with St. Mark, St. Luke, and St. Paul. We make our appeal to the text as it stands ; and, first of all, even as it stands in our own Authorized Version.

The words of St. Mark—in which we insert parentheses to direct attention to the point at issue—are : “ Whosoever shall (put away his wife and) marry another, committeth adultery against her. And if a woman shall (put away her husband and) be married to another, she committeth adultery ” (Mark x. 11, 12).

The words of St. Luke are : “ Whosoever (putteth away his wife and) marieth another, committeth adultery : and whosoever marieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery ” (Luke xvi. 18).

The words of St. Matthew, his only words relating to re-marriage, are : “ Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced, committeth adultery ; ” and again, “ Whosoever shall (put away his wife except it be for fornication, and shall) marry another, committeth adultery ; and whoso marieth her which is put away doth commit adultery ” (Matt. v. 32, and xix. 9.)

St. Mark and St. Luke declare to be guilty of adultery not those who put away their wives, but those who, having put away their wives, marry others. St. Matthew declares (by implication) to be innocent of adultery not those who marry others, but only those who put away their wives for a particular cause, termed in our Bible fornication. But, like St. Mark and St. Luke, he declares of a divorced woman what they declare both of a divorced woman and of a divorced man, namely, that to marry with such a person is adultery.

But here it will be said that the leave given by implication in St. Matthew to put away a wife for fornication includes, by similar implication, a permission to marry another. Granting, for the moment, that the leave to put away is given, we demur to this extension of it. *Why* are we to hold that leave to put away is leave to re-marry ? We admit that the Mosaic permission to divorce in Deuteronomy (Deut. xxiv. 2), included a permission of re-marriage ; but this Mosaic permission is, in express terms, related by St. Matthew himself to have been cancelled by our Lord. “ Moses, because of the hardness of your hearts, suffered you to put away your wives : but from the beginning it was not so. And I say unto you, ” etc. (Matt. xix. 8, 9). So that, whatever else may have been substituted, it is clear that, at least, the law of Moses on this head has been displaced. And we have the clearest scriptural proof from another source that, under the Christian law, the severance of husband and wife does not of

itself include re-marriage, because St. Paul has separated the two things, and where he reluctantly permits the former has expressly prohibited the latter. "Let not the wife depart from her husband: but and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband" (1 Cor. vii. 10, 11). By what authority, then, or upon what ground of reason, is it assumed that a permission to put away for fornication is also, *per se*, a permission to re-marry? It would be surely enough to throw the burden of reply on those whose construction of St. Matthew would place him in conflict with two evangelists and an apostle. But we need not shrink from adducing positive ground to shew that no permission of re-marriage is here given.

In the first place, the exceptive words "saving for the cause of fornication" (chap. v.), and "except it be for fornication" (chap. xix.), are in both the passages of St. Matthew connected by the law of syntax with the putting away, and not with the re-marriage. Let us illustrate this by a parallel case. Suppose we found this precept: "Whosoever shall flog his son, except it be for disobedience, and put him to death, shall be punishable by law." What should we think of the interpreter who founded upon this sentence the position that a father might, for disobedience, flog his son to death? If the lawgiver intended to give this Draconic permission, the rules of speech would inevitably lead him to a different arrangement of his words; and he would say, "Except it be for disobedience, whosoever shall flog his son and put him to death shall be punishable by law;" or else, "Whosoever shall flog his son and put him to death, except it be for disobedience, shall be punishable by law." And yet St. Matthew, avoiding (on the shewing of these torturing expositors) both these natural and regular modes of expression, adopts a method which, by the laws of syntax, defeats his own intention, and this, not on one only, but on both the occasions when he deals with the subject. But now let us look at the cause on the other side. If the exceptive words give a permission, as we contend, only for putting away, and not for re-marriage, everything becomes at once clear and simple; for then the words could only be put in one place of the sentence, and that the one in which we actually find them. So that a violent strain must be first of all inflicted on St. Matthew, in defiance of grammatical rules, in order that through him a like process may subsequently be applied to the other sacred writers.

Even this, however, is not known. We pray the reader to give for the moment a more particular attention to the closing words of St. Matthew in the fifth chapter, "Whosoever shall marry her that is divorced committeth adultery," and to the corresponding words in the nineteenth chapter. It seems too, probable that we translate, in the first case, and in the second, Greek words that are clear, in English words that are ambiguous. The phrases "her that is divorced," in chap. v., and "her which is put away," in chap. xix., are certainly capable of being understood either as "a divorced woman" universally, or "the divorced woman," that is, the woman divorced under the particular circumstances just before described, namely, otherwise than for "fornication." But the Greek original is, according to the highest authority, liable to no such ambiguity. We make our appeal to Bishop Middleton,* who has studied the use of the article in the Hellenistic Greek of the New Testament under the lights

* Middleton on the Greek Article, p. 184, on Matt. v. 32:—

"Ἀπολελυμένην. Not 'her that is divorced,' but *any one* that is divorced. The distinction may appear frivolous, but the principle of the distinction is important. The force of the precept is, indeed, here the same; but that will not always happen."

Scholefield, Bishop Middleton's editor, suggests a proper amendment, "when she is divorced;" but does not express his dissent from the substance of the Bishop's suggestion. See also pp. 6, 156. In the former the Bishop commends Lord Monboddo's definition of the Greek article:—

"It is the prefix of a noun, denoting simply that the noun to which it is prefixed is the same with that which was before mentioned, or is otherwise well known."—Middleton, p. 6.

of modern criticism, and who without hesitation propounds this assertion. He considers it certain, from the now ascertained laws of the Greek language, that, if St. Matthew had meant only to condemn the re-marriage of women divorced otherwise than for "fornication," he must have used the article both in v. 32 and in xix. 9: whereas he has inserted it in neither instance. His expressions are—*ὅς ἐὰν ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσῃ*, and *ὁ ἀπολελυμένην γαμήσας*. They precisely correspond in breadth with the expression of St. Luke—*ὁ ἀπολελυμένην ἀπὸ ἀνδρὸς γαμῶν* (xvi. 18): the sense of St. Mark is the same, though the arrangement of the sentence is somewhat different (Mark x. 12). The words of all three, therefore, condemn re-marriage of the divorced woman, and condemn it universally, in terms which grammatically admit of no other construction. St. Mark and St. Luke differ from St. Matthew in expressly prohibiting the re-marriage of the divorced man as well as of the woman; but under the sanction of none of the three evangelists can any divorced woman be re-married; a fact which cannot be denied, which is of itself directly conclusive of half the question, and which, on the principles of the Christian law, ought to settle the whole of it.

Sustained by such authority as we have quoted, we press even thus far the argument derived from the absence of the article in St. Matthew. But this argument, though sound, is not necessary. In vain is an attempt made to exempt from the general condemnation of re-marriage with a divorced woman the particular case of a woman divorced for adultery and then re-married; because, under the Jewish law, no such case could exist, since the only judicial method of dealing with adultery was by capital punishment.

In fact, it appears, upon a close inspection of the several passages, that the popular sentiment rather strongly inverts the truth of the case as between the three evangelists. On the re-marriage of the woman they are, both in the spirit and in the letter, precisely at one. On the re-marriage of the man they are admitted to agree, except in the case where the woman has been put away for "fornication," and there too they agree, if the words of St. Matthew, in his nineteenth chapter, are taken in their natural order and meaning, and not read under the influence of extraneous prepossession. But it is curious to remark that, as respects the simple putting away of the woman, St. Matthew is in reality the most stringent among them. For St. Mark and St. Luke have no prohibition against the putting away of the woman for any cause, unless re-marriage follows. But St. Matthew, by intimating that in a particular case it may be permitted, inferentially condemns it in every other case.

We have brought the argument to this point upon the supposition that the words of St. Matthew, in chap. v. 32 and chap. xix. 9, set up a real exception, and that, setting apart re-marriage, a full divorce may take place under their authority in the case of "fornication" or adultery by the wife. But we must now proceed to question the whole even of this supposition. We have shewn that the exception, if set up, goes naturally only to the point of putting away, and not to that of liberty to re-marry. But, moreover, we demur to the assumption that the words necessarily set up an exception at all; and we demur to the further assumption that if set up it can be certainly said to be set up in favour of the case of adultery.

This subject has been discussed with care and learning by the "Barrister." The words of exception in St. Matthew v. 32 are *παρέκτος λόγου πορνείας*: and he justly argues that their whole force is to exclude the thing named from the scope of the proposition altogether, but that they rule nothing whatever in an affirmative sense respecting it.^d They would, he observes, instead of "saving for the cause of," be more correctly rendered, "apart from the question of," "without reference to the subject of," or, "independently of a case of." By an exception, we mean that which is capable of coming within a rule, but is taken out of it. The words *παρέκτος λόγου* far more properly designate that which does not belong to the rule at all in its proper signification, but is really irrelevant, though standing in some apparent relation to it. The one is a case of

^d *Considerations on Divorce, etc.*, by a Barrister, p. 17.

what contradicts a rule; the other a case of what does not belong to it, and is in no manner touched by it.

In the corresponding passage of the nineteenth chapter of St. Matthew, the received reading of the words of exception, on which our translation has been founded, was *εἰ μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*. In this case the rendering is unimpeachable; but it is far otherwise with the reading itself. The "Barrister" shew^s that, long ago, high authorities have given the preference to *μὴ ἐπὶ πορνείᾳ*, *non ob fornicationem*, which seems to reduce the phrase nearly to an equivalent of that in St. Matthew v. Among these authorities, it appears that we may name the Complutensian edition, Griesbach, Lucas Brugensis, Selden, and the late Dr. Burton. But the result of the most recent researches upon the text is to be found we apprehend, in the Greek Testament of Lachmann; and he reads the clause in the very words of St. Matthew—*παρέκτος λόγου πορνείας*. Thus the evidence upon the words all tends to shew that their operation is not to except, properly so called, but to set aside by what, borrowing from the fashion of our betters expressed in Parliamentary usage, we may term the previous question. Our Lord, therefore, in this clause should be understood to say, "I do not now speak at all of the case of *πορνεία*, but as to every other case I tell you that whosoever," and so forth.

But now we come to the question which the acuteness and learning of Selden found incapable of clear solution; what is the meaning of the "fornication" of the English, the *πορνεία* of the Greek text? The only thing clear about it is, that the word is not used in its ordinary sense, which confines it to an offence committed by unmarried persons. It has received three principal constructions. Popularly it is, and has now for a long time been assumed to mean, adultery. Some would make it include all forms of sensual sin. Mr. Davies Morgan, in his well-thought, though not so well-written, work, *The Doctrine and Law of Marriage*,^f has an elaborate dissertation, to shew that it means all spiritual incest or apostacy. On the other hand, Milton, and the more rebellious spirits, so far as they condescend to deal with Scripture at all, extend it virtually to everything that can be the subject of dislike, which entirely nullifies our Lord's palpable intention to issue, if not a prohibition, yet a limitation of divorce. But very grave and early writers—Origen, for example, and even St. Augustine—have greatly questioned whether the meaning of the word could be restricted to a single, and that a simply carnal, offence.

There are certainly serious objections to the received and popularly established sense of adultery for the word "fornication" in this place. For adultery is designated by its own proper name in the Greek language (*μοιχεία*), which, unless it be in this clause of exception, is exclusively employed for it throughout the five passages of the Gospels which bear upon the subject of divorce. There is, therefore, something strange in the introduction of a different word to express the same idea, the more so as it is marked by being used both times in the clause of exception, as well as by being used in that clause only. In Matthew xv. 19, and in Mark vii. 21, we find *μοιχεία* along with *πορνεία* in the enumeration of sins, from which the latter term would seem to mean, not merely not adultery in particular, but rather every form of incontinence except adultery; and again it appears clear that there is no other passage in the New Testament in which the word can be shewn to bear the specific sense of adultery.^g

Still we are far from saying it may not be properly so understood by a derivative process; that is to say, as the established meaning of the word relates to mercenary lusts, and as from this it passes to incontinence in general, and as the common form of incontinence in a married person is denominated adultery, we do not venture to deny, and will now for argument's sake assume, the construction to be correct. We may, therefore, suppose our Lord to declare in this clause that, setting apart the question of adultery, a man may not put away his wife.

^e *Considerations*, p. 32.

^f 2 vols. 8vo. Oxford. 1826.

^g Schleusner, *Lex. Nov. Test.*

But this concession will not in the slightest degree assist the adversary. His aim is to shew that a wife may be put away for adultery, so as to leave him free, during her lifetime, to re-marry. But our Saviour's words contain no such statement: even our opponents, with the Greek text in their eye, will admit that they do not contain it explicitly or plainly. But the proposition was one which, if it was meant to be conveyed, especially required to be conveyed in the clearest manner; inasmuch as it was one wholly foreign to the laws of Judæa, which nowhere speak of divorce for adultery. Had such a law existed among the Jews, no doubt an equivocal and indirect allusion might have sufficed; but such a form of speech never could have been the vehicle of an intention of our Lord's, which would actually have gone to repeal an existing and familiar Jewish law, and to put a wholly new one in its place.

Instead of doing all this elaborate and ineffectual violence to the text, let us just remember what was the law of the Jews respecting adultery: it was that both the parties to it should be put to death (Deut. xxii. 20—24). Now, the surrender of a wife to such an operation was evidently susceptible of the general appellation of "putting away," while it was not in reality of the nature of a divorce as far as regards the main question of re-marriage, during the term of the joint lives, since the death of the wife as a matter of course made the husband free. From that passage in St. John which relates to the woman taken in adultery, we perceive that it was not our Lord's intention to disturb, by direct injunction of his own, the existing judicial and penal system; for he did not forbid the stoning, but only exacted that it should be done by those who had not themselves offended—a proceeding which was in entire harmony with the trial by the waters of jealousy ordered in Deuteronomy. Just as plainly, when he said, "Neither do I condemn thee," he did not give his sanction to her being divorced, but rather pointed to her being again received by her husband. Viewed in this light, the supposed exception of St. Matthew is no exception at all, so far as concerns the case of re-marriage, but is a simple parenthesis; while the tenor of the passage is restored to perfect harmony and clearness, and St. Matthew stands in entire unison with the other evangelists. The force of the passage, with the parenthesis, appears then to be this:—"On the subject of divorce, setting aside the case of adultery or the wife's incontinence, which is provided for by a separate law, I tell you that whosoever puts away his wife causes her to commit adultery; and whosoever marries a woman put away commits adultery." This construction of the passage, presuming the parenthesis to refer to adultery, is in every way consistent. It adheres to syntax, follows the natural import of the words, tallies exactly with the state of the Jewish laws, fulfils the condition of intelligibility to the hearers, and not only leaves no discrepancy between St. Matthew and his co-evangelists, but gives force and propriety at once to his insertion and to their omission; to the insertion, because it has reference to the ideas and practices of Jews, for whom St. Matthew wrote,—and to the omission, because the clause had absolutely no meaning for Gentiles, whom St. Mark and St. Luke had it for their purpose to inform. Nor is it less natural that St. Paul should avoid any reference to the subject in addressing the Christians of Rome.

If, then, we travel so far in company with our opponents as to adopt the common opinion about the meaning of the word translated "fornication," even with this assumption brought in aid their conclusion cannot stand. On the contrary, it has been justly observed by Bishop Burgess,^{*} that, as the one exception designated by the parenthesis, if it be properly so termed at all, derives its force from the death of the party, *cessante causâ cessat effectus*, it is and can be of no force except where the party dies. But that common opinion of the meaning of the word is far from being supported either by universal authority or by demonstrative reason. On the contrary, there is no small likelihood that, in conformity with the known language of the Old Testament, the word "fornication" may designate a spiritual and not a sensual evil. Etymologically it is not tied to the one rather than the other sense, and usage will

^{*} Quoted in Morgan, ii. 61.

sanction either. The original idea is that of sale and transfer; and some are of opinion that the original word *πόρνη* means a harlot, because in Greece those unhappy persons had usually been purchased, or were purchaseable, as being slaves. We refer the reader to the *Lexicon* of Schleusner for instances (take, for example, Rev. ii. 22), where the unlawful commerce indicated is that of the soul; and to the work of Mr. Davies Morgan,ⁱ for reasons and authorities in support of the conclusion that in this passage we ought so to understand it. It will then mean heathenism, idolatry, or apostacy from God. And it is easy to shew that such a signification harmonizes, perhaps even more remarkably than the sense of adultery, with the Jewish laws, while it is entirely consonant with the doctrine of St. Paul.

First as to the Jewish laws. It was absolutely forbidden under the Mosaic law to contract marriages with aliens in religion, as may be seen from Ex. xxxiv. 14—16, and from Deut. vii. 3: "Neither shalt thou make marriages with them: thy daughter thou shalt not give unto his son, nor his daughter shalt thou take unto thy son." They were, therefore, in law originally void. And upon this principle we find that after the captivity Ezra rebuked the people in the mass for having taken such wives, and required that they should all be put away; to which the people assented. Nehemiah, for a similar purpose, "contended with them, and cursed them, and smote certain of them, and plucked off their hair, and made them swear by God" (Ezra ix., and x. 1—14; Neh. xiii. 23—31). If, then, our Saviour refers to marriages which had been contracted with women that were in spiritual fornication, either they were so when married, or they had become so since. If the former, the case is not one of divorce at all, but of a declaratory process where the marriage had been originally null. If the latter, if the wife had become idolatrous or apostate, the case is one of divorce in the sense of putting away, and in that sense the words of our Saviour harmonize with the directions of St. Paul; but, as we have already shewn, the authority to put away does not, *per se*, involve authority to re-marry, and the question of re-marriage receives its direct and decisive settlement, so far as she is concerned, under the consentient words of St. Luke, St. Mark, and St. Matthew in each of his two passages.

As regards the liberty of the man to re-marry, we refer to the previous argument, and to what will presently be said on the subject of desertion. And as to that construction of the word *πορνεία*, not in our opinion the best supported, which makes it mean all incontinence, the argument of the pamphlet named before sufficiently proves that the parenthesis, when thus understood, is still essentially and exclusively Jewish, and ceases to operate with the cessation of the Mosaic dispensation.

We will now release the reader from this wearisome but necessary inquiry, so far as it relates to the grand fiction of the case, the supposed authority to re-marry in the case of adultery—only subjoining two remarks. The first remark is, that this authority is extended by the Bill from the man to the woman with a strange and self-condemning inconsistency. In the express words of St. Paul and of two evangelists, with whom the third, as we have seen, stands in harmony, by the adamant laws of grammar, the re-marriage of the woman is condemned. With the aid of licentious construing and of arbitrary deduction from the supposed liberty of the man, it is set up again for the case of adultery. It then becomes, one would suppose, a sacred Scriptural right, and nothing remains but the proof of adultery in the husband to entitle the innocent wife to a divorce. But, strange to say, our misinterpreters of Scripture, after having by force extorted from it this freedom for the woman, then, by like force, withhold from her hands all but a very small modicum of the ill-gotten treasure; for the adultery of the husband is not to entitle the wife to a divorce *a vinculo*; she can only have it when the adultery is joined with desertion, cruelty, bigamy, or incest. Our second remark is, that the misinterpretation of Scripture now before us betrays itself at every step by new inconsistencies. For if it were tenable, the consequence would be that a woman justly divorced for adultery

ⁱ Vol. ii., p. 88, and Appendix I.

might re-marry, but that a woman improperly divorced, without fault on her own part, could not. All the re-mariages, therefore, of women who have been divorced for adulteries have been innocent; but the re-mariages of those who had been innocent have been adulteries!

We shall deal much more summarily with the other supposed case of Scriptural divorce *a vinculo*, that of desertion; for it admits of being simply handled, and, though we may shortly hear more of it, it has no reference to the scheme now before the world.

St. Paul, in his Second Epistle to the Corinthians, positively forbids the contraction of marriages with unbelievers: *μη γίνεσθε ἑτεροζυγούμενοι ἀπίστοις*, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers" (2 Cor. vi. 13): an awkward translation; for the meaning seems rather to be simply "*Become* not yoke-fellows with unbelievers." A question, however, could not but arise in infant communities, formed peacemeal out of the Gentile world, how to deal with those cases where one only of a married couple had embraced the Gospel. And this question St. Paul had solved in his First Epistle, but by way of counsel on his own authority. The words where he proceeds to grant a certain liberty are, "But to the rest speak I, not the Lord" (1 Cor. vii. 12): and, we ask, can anything more touchingly indicate the jealous care of our Lord and Saviour over the great institution of marriage than that, when a case of temporary anomaly had occurred which seemed to require a provision in apparent conflict with the general character of its obligations, this leave should be conveyed not direct from the fountainhead of sacred inspiration, but simply as the human thought of Christian wisdom? The effect is that, if in this licence given by St. Paul there seem to be anything at variance with the divinely described character of marriage, it is *ipso facto* null.

But there is no such contrariety. St. Paul's counsel is, that if the believing husband and unbelieving wife are jointly minded to continue in conjugal union, they may and shall so continue (verses 12—15). "But if the unbelieving depart, let him depart." The words that follow are, "a brother or a sister is not under bondage in such cases:" and if they refer to the case just before described, the meaning seems to be, "If he is resolved to separate, accept the separation; do not attempt to follow him; the marriage tie does not bind you in such cases against the tie of the Christian covenant." But in this contingency of desertion, there is not the faintest allusion to the liberty of re-marriage. That question seems to be ruled effectually, and for the woman expressly, in the negative by the antecedent words (ver. 11), in which St. Paul, speaking now by inspiration, says, "But and if she depart, let her remain unmarried, or be reconciled to her husband."

And, finally, let us observe what was the nature of the marriage contract with which the apostle is here dealing. It was not the high Christian rite, celebrated by the Church and before God, and by his authority exalted to be a figure of the indissoluble union between Christ and his universal Church; it was the simple contract of marriage, into which men entered by the law of nature outside the pale of revelation, and which, though a healthful institution, and a valid agreement, was not, and could not be, parallel to the marriage of Christians. It is this natural and civil marriage which St. Paul says may, for difference of religion, be broken by separation. But we leave the reader to judge what parallel there is in the cases, or what inference can be drawn from the liberty of a Christian to remain separate, without re-marriage, upon being deserted by an unbeliever, after a marriage made in heathenism, in favour of the opinion that a Christian, after a Christian marriage, may, when deserted, not simply remain separate, but proceed to re-marry.

We have done now with the Scripture argument; and we aver that St. Paul does no more than echo the consentient teaching of all parts of the New Testament when he says to the Romans (vii. 2, 3):—

"The woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband so long as he liveth; but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband.

"So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she

shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man."

For Christians, marriage is, according to the Holy Scripture, a lifelong compact, which may sometimes be put in abeyance by the separation of a couple, but which never can be rightfully dissolved, so as to set them free, during their joint lives, to unite with other persons.

Double Narrative of the Creation in Genesis.—The present division of the Old Testament into chapters originated in the thirteenth century.* It is a great convenience for the purpose of reference, but justly complained of by the critics as sometimes injurious to the sense. If we take the beginning of Genesis, for example, and divide it naturally, *i. e.*, with regard to the style and subject-matter, we shall find that the first section, or larger paragraph, extends to the third verse of chap. ii. inclusive; the second section to the end of chap. iii. This gives us two accounts of the creation; the one in the first section; and the other, which includes an account of the fall, in the second. The grounds of this division, so far as our present subject is concerned, are principally these:

1. The first section of Genesis, according to our division, has a visible unity, it being the history of seven successive days. The second section has also an unity of its own. The beginning and end of it both refer to the garden of Eden.

2. The second section has a distinct superscription, Gen. ii. 4. Compare similar superscriptions, Gen. v. 1; x. 1; xi. 10; xxxvi. 1; but see also Gen. x. 20, 31, 32; xxxvi. 30; Ps. lxxii. 20. Sometimes we find double titles. See Gen. x., xxxvi.

3. In the first section, the Deity is called *Elohim* (God) thirty-five times, and by no other name. In the second section, he is called *Jehovah Elohim* (Lord God) nineteen times, and by no other name, where the writer speaks in his own person. There are three instances in which the woman or serpent speaks, and the deity is called *Elohim*, Gen. iii. 1, 3, 5.

4. We should judge, *humane loqui*, that the writer of the first section had a digested plan before him. Hence a certain rhythmus and uniformity in the structure of his sentences. The style of the second section is more simple and artless. Hence the writer of it often finds occasion to go back, in order to mention circumstances which he had omitted in their proper place. After noticing the formation of man, and being about to place him in the garden of Eden, he goes back to describe the planting and location of that garden, chap. ii. 8—15. Man is placed in Eden, and the temptation is at hand; the sacred penman goes back to notice the origin of the woman, as she was a partner with him in the transgression. This again leads the writer to describe the occasion of her being created, chap. ii. 18—25.

5. Some apparent inconsistencies:

(1.) In the first section man appears to be created, *ἀμεσως*, and at the same time with woman, Gen. i. 26, 27. In the second, he is formed from the dust, chap. ii. 7; iii. 19, and woman afterwards, ii. 22.

(2.) In the first section, plants are produced by the mere will of God, and before the creation of man, Gen. i. 11, 26. In the second, plants appear to originate from natural causes and from human culture, chap. ii. 5—8.

(3.) In the first section, the earth has more of a Neptunian origin, Gen. i. 2. In the second, more of a Vulcanian, chap. ii. 5, 6.

Whether these dissonances are real or merely apparent, it is not our purpose here to discuss. We believe them capable of a plausible solution,

6. Some repetitions:

(1.) The creation of man is mentioned, Gen. i. 27, and again, chap. ii. 7.

(2.) The creation of man is mentioned, Gen. i. 21, 25, and again, chap. ii. 19.

We have been willing to dwell on this apparently unimportant subject, and to exhibit it in detail, because we believe that the separation of the seventh day from the first chapter, to which it properly belongs, has had, in several respects, an injurious tendency.

* See S. Davidson's *Biblical Criticism*, vol. i., p. 60.

(1.) It has obscured the intelligent understanding of this portion of Genesis.

(2.) It has favoured the erroneous idea held by some critics, that the verses relating to the sabbath are an addition of a later age, and thus lessened the authority of the sabbath.

(3.) It has led to the unfounded supposition, held by many geologists and by some theologians, that by days are *intended* long periods of time; an idea, which I think would never have been cherished, if the history of the first seven days had appeared, as it should have done, in its true and proper connexion.

We have also another object in this communication, namely, to exhibit a specimen of the mode of reasoning on which the theory of the documentary origin of Genesis is supposed to rest. This, however, is one of the more striking cases.

Our theologians, English and Americans, have been very reluctant to admit this theory. But we do not see how the truth of it can well be denied, nor is it in our view inconsistent with the divine authority which we wish to attach to the Bible. Late German writers, regarded as orthodox, particularly Fr. Delitsch, in his *Commentary on Genesis*, (Leips. 1853,) have adopted the theory, and Alex. Mac Whorter, in his *Yahveh Christ*, has also admitted it. It is not a question to be decided by appeals to popular prejudices, but by a candid examination of all the facts.

Original Language.—Those who hold to the unity of the human race hold of course to an original language. Those who hold to an original language naturally wish to shew how and in what order the different families of languages have separated themselves from the main stock.

Chevalier Bunsen and Max Müller have been labouring on this subject with great assiduity, and think to have arrived at important results.

The interesting problem before them is, *to place the various families of languages in the line of successive development.*

The earliest type of language is supposed to have been monosyllabic. Many substantial reasons might be given in favour of this supposition.

The Chinese and other monosyllabic languages of Asia went off from the main stock, while it was yet in a rude or inorganic state. These languages have been called *family* languages. Some cause, to us unknown, seems to have stereotyped these languages in this early stage of their existence, and to have prevented their further development.

At a subsequent period, when the main stock had assumed somewhat of an organic character, the Tartar or Turanian languages detached themselves on one side, and Hamitism, or the language of Egypt, on the other; the former with a slight tincture of Iranianism, or tendency to the Indo-European character, and the latter with a tincture of Shemitism. These languages are called *nomad* languages, as having advanced farther than the family languages.

At a later period the Semitic and Iranian or Indo-European languages developed themselves into opposite directions. These are called *political* or *state* languages, as exhibiting the highest degree of refinement. But although thus contrasted, they exhibit when viewed from a more distant stand-point, many undoubted resemblances.

To complete this view, the languages of America and Oceanica are thought to be connected with the Turanian; and the African are united conjecturally with the Hamitic or Coptic, and, perhaps, far southward, with the Turanian.

This theory only settles the order of development. It determines nothing as to the time which is requisite.—*Professor J. W. Gibbs, to appear in New Englander for November, 1857.*

Antique printed Bibles, etc.—The following were sold by Messrs. Sotheby and Wilkinson in August last.

Bible. The Golden Legende, conteynyng the Lyves and Hystories taken out of the Byble, and Legendes of the Saintes, two parts in one, woodcuts. Black letter, very rare, fine large copy, but wanting six leaves in the second part (folio 40, 41, 42, 43, 111, and 258 containing colophon), splendidly bound in morocco, super extra, gilt edges, tooled in the antique style, by Hayday. Julian Notary, 1503. This extraordinary work exhibits the earliest printed specimen

of an English translation of the Bible, or rather portions, as it confines itself chiefly to the historical books and gospels. A very curious fact is that the editor and translator, William Caxton, has used the word "breches" in his rendering of Genesis iii. 7: "And thenne they toke fygge levys and sewed theym togyder for to cover theyr membres in the maner of breches," shewing that the Genevan version is not the original of this quaint expression. 21l.

Biblia. The Bible, that is the Holy Scripture of the Olde and New Testament, faithfully and truly translated out of Douche and Latyn into Englishe (by Miles Coverdale). Woodcuts by H. L. Beham (No. 1 of Lea Wilson). Black letter (Angular Swiss or German), quite perfect, with the exceptions mentioned in the note, bound in rich brown morocco super extra, tooled edges and sides, by F. Bedford. First English Bible printed, extremely rare, 1535. This first Protestant translation of the whole Bible into English, and probably one of the rarest books in the language, is considered as the joint production of Tyndale and Coverdale, but is usually termed *Coverdale's Bible*. The possession of a fragment only of our earliest Bible has always been deemed a *sine qua non* with biblical collectors, and the prices paid for such fragments ranging from 30l. to 150l., is the surest test of the difficulty experienced in procuring even these. The present is a most desirable copy, but having the preliminary leaves, folios 1, 2, 5, 6 in Genesis, the last seven leaves of Revelation, and the maps in wonderful fac simile by Harris. When it is remembered that no perfect copy as yet is known, and that the Earl of Leycester's is the only one with the title, we need not be surprised at the late Mr. Lea Wilson, who possessed one with title and first leaf of dedication in fac simile, offering 100l. to any person furnishing him the original title, and the like sum for the next leaf, or that he did not live to see the accomplishment of his earnest desire to be the owner of the first complete copy. At his death, his copy passed into the hands of Mr. Dunn Gardner, at whose sale, on July 7th, 1854, despite the fac similes, it produced 365l. Mr. Henry Stevens, in his forthcoming account of English Bibles, has the following interesting note with regard to the printing of the work: "Nothing whatever is known as to where or by whom it was printed. Since the time of Humphrey Wanley it has generally been ascribed to Christopher Froschover, of Zurich, who printed the quarto edition in a similar, though smaller type, in 1550; but Christopher Anderson, in his *Annals of the English Bible*, says, in his Historical Index, p. 31, that Froschover 'was certainly not the printer of Coverdale's Bible in 1535, as ascertained by the present author when at Zurich.' Anderson does not give the grounds of his conclusion, but he is probably correct, as no conclusive evidence has yet been adduced in favour of the Zurich printer. My late and lamented friend Mr. William Pickering had as early as August, 1851, completed a series of investigations, by which he came to the conclusion that the book was printed by Christian Egenolf, of Frankfort. He based his argument upon the similarity of the woodcuts and the type of Coverdale's Bible, and a German Bible of the same sized page printed by Egenolf in 1534; and upon a little volume of Bible plates by H. S. Beham, first printed by Egenolf in 1533, and again in 1536, 1539, and 1551, with some additions." Mr. Stevens, however, after examining the works mentioned by Pickering, came to precisely the opposite conclusion, for he found that although the woodcuts and type *closely resembled* each other, they were not *identical*, and therefore naturally observes, "As it is unlikely that any printer of that day would have in his office two sets of woodcuts and two founts of type so nearly alike, yet different, we may, I think, fairly conclude that Egenolf was not the printer." Mr. Stevens seems to have taken great pains to solve the mystery, but after many fruitless comparisons of his Coverdale with works from the presses of coeval printers, candidly confesses, "I have found no clue." A leaf of Egenolf's German Bible of 1534 is inserted in the present copy, so as to enable every beholder to judge this knotty point by comparing the one with the other. 190l.

Bible (The), which is all the Holy Scripture, in whych are contayned the Olde and Newe Testament truly and purely translated into Englysh by Thomas Matthew. Woodcuts. Black letter, very rare (No. 4 of Lea Wilson), a desirable volume, but has the title and next five leaves in admirable fac simile, and

wants the first and last of the thirteen leaves of table, the list of books, the title to the New Testament, O 1 in Revelation, the last leaf of the New Testament, and the two following leaves of table. A few leaves mutilated are mended. No other defects are known, but the volume was sold not subject to collation. Good copy, in old calf, 1537. This edition was apparently printed abroad for Grafton and Whitchurch, and although the version is styled Matthew's, it varies but little from Tyndal and Coverdale's translation, the few emendations and additions it contains having been furnished by John Rogers, the first martyr in Queen Mary's reign, who under the assumed name of Matthew superintended the publication. The work is beautifully printed, but a few important errors occur in the text, *e. g.* John xx., "and put my finger into the holes of the nails," is omitted, and so is in 1 Cor. xi., "This cup is the New Testament in my blood." In Hebrews vi., "Let us love the doctrine," is printed for "Leave the doctrine." The disputed verse in 1 John v. 7, is in smaller type. 23*l.*

Bible (The Most Sacred), which is the Holy Scripture, conteyning the Old and New Testament, translated into English, and newly recognized with great diligence, after most faythful exemplars, by Rychard Taverner. Black letter (No. 5 of Lea Wilson), fine copy, quite complete, with the exception of having the title in beautiful fac simile by Harris, and wanting the three leaves of table at end; morocco extra, gilt edges, by F. Bedford. John Byddell for Thomas Barthlet, 1539. This is the first edition of Taverner's Bible, and is of great rarity. In it the disputed text, 1 John v. 7, is printed in smaller type. The word *peace* is uniformly printed *peax*, thus shewing its transition from the Latin. Mr. Lea Wilson not having been fortunate enough to secure a perfect copy, fell into some errors in giving his collation. 36*l.*

Byble (The) in Englyshe, of the largest and greatest volume, auctorysed and apoynted by the commaundement of oure moost redoubted Prynce, and Soueraygne Lorde, Kyng Henrye the VIII., supreme heade of this his church and Realme of Englande; to be frequented and used in every church wth this his said realme, accordynge to the tenour of his former iniunctions geuen in that behalfe. Ouersene and perused at the cōmaundmēt of the kynges hyghnes, by the ryghte reuerende fathers in God Cuthbert [Tonstall] bysshop of Duresme, and Nicolas [Heath] bisshop of Rochester, 1541. Black letter, extremely rare, fine copy, quite complete; morocco, super extra, gilt edges, by F. Bedford. Printed by Edward Whitchurch, fynyshe in Nov. 1541. This is apparently No. 11 or 12 of Lea Wilson's list, whose copy must have been not quite perfect. The title within the Holbein border has the arms of Cromwell effaced, and the wood block cracked. The Prologue of Archbishop Cranmer occupieth three leaves. We do not call to mind a perfect copy of this edition of Cranmer's Bible having occurred for sale for many years. 90*l.*

Henry VIII. Booke called the Institution of a Christian Man, black letter, 4*l.* 10*s.* First Edition of Milton's Paradise Lost, 1667, 14*l.* 10*s.* The Newe Testament in Englyshe and Latin of Erasmus Translacion (Tyndale's version, edited by Sir John Cheke), 22*l.* A fine copy of De Bry's Collectiones Peregrinationum in Indiam Orientalem et in Indiam Occidentalem, in 10 vols., profusely illustrated, 1590-1634, 160*l.* De Bry's Merveilleux et Estrange Rapport, toutefois fidele, des Commoditez que se trouvent en Virginia, 1590, 18*l.* 10*s.* Dives et Pauper, that is to say, the riche and the pore, fructuously trectyng upon the X. Commaundementes, black letter, 50*l.* Higden (Ranulph, Monk of Chestre) Polychronicon, in whiche book ben comprised wonderful historyes, etc., black letter, Caxton, 1482, 70*l.* Shakespeare Plays, Third Impression, 1664, 26*l.* 10*s.* Vorigine's Golden Legende, translated by William Caxton, black letter, printed by Wynkyn de Worde, 1527, 23*l.* 10*s.*—*Literary Gazette.*

Sale of Rare Books.—The choice collection of English and Foreign theology and miscellaneous literature, including some Oriental manuscripts, the property of the late Mr. John Leslie, of Great Queen Street, has been disposed of by Messrs. Southgate and Barrett. The following may be quoted:—Acta Sanctorum, collecta et Notis illustrata à C. Byeo et aliis, Presbyteris Societatis Jesu Theologis, 4 vols. in 7, folio, Bruxelles, 1845-53, 6 guineas.—Augustini (S.

Aurelli) Opera, cum Vita et Indice Generale, Editio Benedictina, 11 vols. in 15, fcap. 8vo, calf extra, Paris, 1836-40, 9 guineas.—Concilia Sacrosancta, ab Initiis, Christianæ Religionis ad Annum 1564, studio Labbæi et Cossartii, cum Indicibus et Apparatu curâ Jacobatii, 18 vols. folio, calf, Paris, 1671-2, 7l. 15s.—Bhagvat-Geeta Purana, with the Heetopades or the Incarnation of Wisdom, a richly illuminated MS. in Sanscrit, on the purest vellum, 45 feet 7 inches long, and 4½ inches wide, bordered with gold and arabesque blazon, and illustrated with forty-seven miniatures representing Ganestra, the Hindoo Minerva, and the Avatars or Incarnations of Vishnoo, mounted on rollers, and inclosed in a glazed mahogany case. This MS. is a perfect specimen of Eastern miniature illustration and arabesque illumination, 25l. 10s. (Quaritch).—A Persian MS. roll, being an Historical and Genealogical Table of the Emperors of Hindostan, from Timur the Great to Mahomet Ackbar Badsha (father of the present King of Delhi), exquisitely written in twelve compartments, surrounded by a broad border of bright gold, with other illuminations, measuring 5 feet 10 inches long, and 2 feet 8 inches wide, mounted on rollers, 4 guineas.—A Pali MS. in beautiful preservation, written on talipot leaves, said to be of considerable historical interest, 5l.—Mitarelli (Joh. Bened.) et Ans. Costadoni Annales Camaldulenses Ordinis S. Benedicti, Italico-monasticas Res, etc., 9 vols. folio, plates, vellum, scarce, Venetiis, 1755-73, 4l. 15s.—Tillemont (L. S. le Nain de), Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire Ecclésiastique, et Histoire des Empe-reurs des six premières siècles, 22 vols. 4to, Italian vellum, Venice, 1732, 5l.—Vasquez (P. Gabrielis, Soc. Jesu) Commentarii ac Disputationes, 9 vols. in 5, folio, fine large copy, in the original calf binding, with clasps, very rare, Antverpiæ, 1621. The works of this celebrated Thomist hold the highest rank in scholastic divinity, and copies now seldom occur for sale, 10l. 15s. (Stewart).—Wilkins (Davidis) Concilia Magnæ Britanniae et Hiberniae, a Synoda Verolamiensi, A.D. 446, ad Londinensem, A.D. 1717, 4 vols. folio, hogskin, from Mr. Dansey's library, very rare, Lond. 1737, 19l. (Brown).—The Books of Common Prayer, from the Reign of Edward VI. to the Present Time, viz.: 1. The First Book of Edward VI., 1549; 2. The Second Book of Edward VI., 1552; 3. The First Book of Queen Elizabeth, 1559; 4. King James's Book, as settled at Hampton Court, 1604; 5. The Scotch Book of Charles I. (Archb. Laud's), 1637; 6. King Charles II.'s Book, as settled at the Savoy Conference, 1662; 6 vols. folio, printed in black letter, and rubricated, in the style of the original editions, with fac-similes of the titles and capitals, uncut, 1844, 4l. 12s.—The Book of Common Prayer, for the use of the Church of Scotland (Archbp. Laud's), with the Proclamation, dated Dec. 20, 1636, Edinb., R. Young, 1637; with the Psalter, 1836; 1 vol. folio, slightly stained, antique calf, gilt edges, very rare, 2l. 7s.—The Book of Common Prayer, folio, the Victoria edition, of the late W. Pickering, beautifully printed in black letter by C. Whittingham, superbly bound in dark olive morocco, super extra gilt leaves, the back and sides covered with gold tooling, by Rivière, 1844 (exhibited at the Palais d'Industrie, Paris, where it was pronounced to be the choicest specimen of English binding), 2l. 12s.—*Athenæum*.

Antiquities, etc., of the Holy Land.—Several objects of interest were shewn us by our guide, an old Christian Arab, called Thomas, such as a stone in a wall which our Lord touched as he went through this street to the hall of judgment, then a stone pillar, nearly sunk in the ground, and where he is said to have rested. We passed under an archway, where it is supposed that Pilate shewed our Lord to the people; it is called, therefore, the arch of "Ecce Homo." . . .

The Pool of Bethesda is surrounded by buildings on three sides; on the east side, where I sat, is a very low, ruinous wall, with wild flowers growing all over it. The pool is very deep—nothing in it but large mounds of green turf; the only appearance of water was that of a scanty stream trickling out from a wall belonging to a Turkish public bath. This spot is, indeed, one of the "waste places" of Jerusalem. . . .

I one day made a long visit to the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, and saw nearly everything. Almost the first object of interest pointed out to the stranger is a long marble slab on the pavement like a tombstone. At each end were

three very large candlesticks covered with red velvet. At this spot it is said our Saviour was anointed for his burial. People were prostrating themselves on the slab, and kissing it. To the left, not far off, is shewn the place where the Virgin stood while the body was anointed. On the right are the tombs of Godfrey of Bouillon, of Balwin the First, and Melchisedech, and the small chapel of St. John the Baptist, and Adam. There is a grating in the wall of this chapel, where a fissure in the rock is shewn which was formed when the "rocks were rent," at the crucifixion of our Lord. . . .

Continuing our ride to Baniyas, on the way from Nazareth to Damascus, we toiled up steep, rocky paths, where we found trees and shrubs very abundant, particularly on grassy table land. We met people travelling, women on horse-back wearing the curious horn, which is fixed on the front of the head, and fastened behind. This *tantur*, or horn, is made of tin silver, or gold, according to the rank or wealth of the wearer. Some are a yard long, shaped like a speaking-trumpet. It rises from the forehead, and is fastened at the back of the head by a band. A large veil is thrown over it, and falls down the sides of the head and shoulders. It is usually worn only by married women; but I believe unmarried women also occasionally wear it. There are many references to this horn in the Old Testament. It was sometimes worn by men. Job says, "I have sewed sackcloth upon my skin, and defiled my horn in the dust" (Job xvi. 15); and David, alluding to the righteous, says, in Psalm cxii. 9, "His horn shall be exalted with honour."

The vegetation was unusually rich; and there was a brook rushing by old towers and walls, and over foundations of ancient buildings, and great massive pieces of rock and stone scattered about, which almost impeded the course of this small, energetic stream, which was the Jordan. Tall trees mingled with the ancient ruins and modern town, and wild flowers peeped up among loose stones and hidden heaps of rock.

Our tents were placed under a grove of olive-trees—a more beautiful situation could not have been chosen—and from it, though surrounded by hills and much foliage, there was a charming view. Just below the tents was the Jordan with its thickly-wooded banks. Beyond, here and there, one caught a glimpse of some picturesque old buildings, shaded by olive-trees, and the whole was backed by grassy hills and trees which rose close to the town.

One of the sources of the Jordan is at Baniyas; we went, soon after our arrival, to the cave from whence it springs. It does not flow freely at first, stones impeding its rapid progress. We had now traced the holy river in all its length, from its mouth to its source.

"Stream most blest for his dear sake,
Who touch'd its sacred wave, and hallow'd all its ground."

Over the cave where the Jordan (which is there called Nas Mahr) rises at Baniyas, are small niches, in which, probably, statues were once placed. On a tablet over these niches is a Greek inscription. . . .

The approach to the city, coming from Jerusalem, is anything but imposing. On each side of a very long, ill-paved road, are miserable looking houses (made of the same material as the walls of the gardens before-mentioned), and dilapidated mosques. I thought we must be in the suburbs; but as we rode on we found that we were in the "pearl surrounded by emeralds," as Damascus has been called. This long paved road terminated in several narrower ones, in which butchers' stalls were plentiful. We then entered the bazaar, under a roof which must have been many feet above us, with shops on each side. Emerging from this covered place, through an archway with two doors—one very rickety, the other prostrate—I thought we should now see palaces, gardens, and terraces, but there were still only poor looking dwelling-houses, which the minarets near them, falling into decay, seemed ready to crush.

On we went, and entered a second very extensive covered bazaar. It was very dark and crowded, and my horse's head often rested on some turbaned gentleman's shoulders, who seemed quite accustomed to this, and merely looked at me while he moved, as well as he could, to one side, where probably he would

meet another horse or donkey. I could scarcely look at anything, having to guide my horse through these dark passages. At length we arrived at our journey's end, and I was glad to dismount near a fountain in the court-yard of the hotel, into which I gladly entered, to find peace and repose in the cool, large, and beautiful room prepared for me.

The outside of the hotel did not promise well. Nowhere more than at Damascus must one attend to the old proverb, "Never go by appearances"—that is, as far as houses are concerned.

My room was as curious as it was handsome, large and lofty, with a fountain in the centre. Steps on three sides led up to platforms, one of which was arranged as a sitting-room, the other two as sleeping apartments. The ceiling was about thirty feet high, of carved wood, painted red, green, and purple, and here and there gilt. To the height of about four feet the walls were ornamented with beautiful coloured designs, and the floor in parts was of variegated marble.—*Journal of Viscountess Falkland.*

The Dead Sea.—Letters have been recently received at Munich, from Dr. Roth, who, it will be remembered, was sent at the expense of the present king of Bavaria, to explore scientifically the shores of the Dead Sea, and the land bordering the river Jordan on both sides. According to his private letters and his report, the first expedition has been most successful; its object was thoroughly to examine the valley which separates the Dead Sea from the Red Sea, in order to settle the mooted point as to the exact position and extent of the old bed of the Jordan. In order to facilitate his researches, Roth engaged the Schah Hainzees-Seru, a relative of the chief of the Jehalin Arabs, whose pasture lands lie to the south of the Hebron, to conduct and protect his small caravan. On the 6th of April Dr. Roth left Jerusalem, and journeyed south of the Dead Sea till he came to the shores of the Red Sea, and making a considerable circuit, returned again to his starting place. He performed this dangerous journey without suffering from illness, or being greatly inconvenienced either by the heat or the badness of the water, but was seriously interrupted, and finally obliged to hurry on his expedition, by the dangerous state of the country, which was infested by powerful bands of robbers as careless of human life as they were greedy of booty. Dr. Roth was forced to leave much territory unexamined which he had determined to explore. He has forwarded to Munich very valuable barometrical and geographical observations, copies of which have been transmitted to Dr. Petermann of Gotha. A complete scientific report of the first expedition is expected at Munich.

At the Syro-Egyptian Society, June 9th.—1. Mr. Sharpe described some of the principal Egyptian monuments in the British Museum, mentioning their date, their material, their style of art, and what may be learned from them as to the mythology of the Egyptians, and also as to the changes in their religious opinions as shown by the intentional alterations which they had undergone. He mentioned the four-sided altar of Thothmosis III. made in honour of Amun-ra, which was afterwards adapted to the god Mandoo-ra. This change he supposed had been made after Thebes had fallen, and the sovereignty of the country had passed into the hands of the kings of Lower Egypt. The plaster-cast from the great obelisk at Karnac, as Mr. Bonomi points out, betrays the same, and also a second change; there we see the name and ornaments of Amun-ra cut in, on the very spot from which they had before been cut out. This second change Mr. Sharpe thought had been made under the Ptolomies. Two highly polished and beautifully carved slabs of basalt he thought belonged to the little temple mentioned by Herodotus at Sais, which measured in its three directions, thirty feet, twenty-one feet, and twelve feet; this, Herodotus was told, was cut out of one single enormous block of stone. But this was probably a mistake; perhaps the priest meant to tell him that each part was a single block of stone. These two slabs were two of the intercolumnar walls of this diminutive temple. The forepart of the colossal foot of white marble sent from Alexandria by Mr. Harris, Mr. Sharpe considered was once part of the statue of Serapis,

which was destroyed by the Christians in the reign of Theodosius. The statue was built of wood, clothed with drapery down to the ground, and had a golden face, and this half of a marble foot probably peeped from under its robe. The four lesser gods of the dead, to whom the Canobic jars were dedicated, had names which he translated the Bleeder, the Carpenter, the Painter, and the Digger. These gods watched over those parts of the art of mummy-making, and their jars held those parts of the body which had to be removed before the mummy was made. Of the tombs brought from the neighbourhood of the pyramids, Mr. Sharpe argued that the style of art, together with the small false doors, disproved the opinion of Bunsen and Lepsius, that they were made under the so-called fourth dynasty. He thought that king Mesaphra, whose name they bore, was the same person as Thothmosis II. 2. Mr. Bonomi then read a paper on the "Identification of certain Figures on the Walls of the Palace of Sennacherib, at Khorsabad, with some of the Officers of that Sovereign mentioned in Scripture." He began by describing the shape of the mound on which the palace was built, and the extent of the square inclosure contiguous to it, which he held to be the Paradisios, or pleasure-grounds attached to that royal abode. He then led us to the gate, which gave access to the mound or platform of the palace, and shewed us a drawing of the colossal figure standing between two human-headed winged bulls, which, for certain specified reasons, he identified as a figure of Nimrod. We were then conducted into the courts of the palace, and shown the figures, Rabshakeh, Rabsaris, and Tartan, all which figures he described as the full-length portraits, in the Assyrian style, of the persons holding those offices in the reign of Sennacherib, and probably the very individuals whom that king sent to Jerusalem in the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah. He also identified the person of a "magician," and of a "ruler of a province," of which officers we read in the second and third chapters of Daniel; and, lastly, remarked that these images of the Chaldeans or magicians were really "*portrayed with vermilion*," as described in the twenty-third chapter of Ezekiel. 3. Mr. C. G. Harle exhibited a colossal facsimile drawing of an Assyrian slab in the British Museum, known by the description, "a four-winged figure with thunderbolts chasing a demon," and which he pointed out, corresponded with Berossus's description of Belus—the Bel and Baal of the Bible.

At the Royal Society of Literature, July 22, Mr. Birch read a paper, "On the Political System of Egypt under the Pharaohs," in which he gave a careful analysis of its form of government, classified the various offices, with lists of the different functionaries employed under its rulers, and pointed out that the latter dominion in that country of the Macedonians and the Romans was unquestionably founded upon the native polity which had survived from the earliest ages down to the conquest of Egypt by Alexander the Great. Through all the phases of rulers which Egypt underwent, the four great social castes, of the Priest, the Scribe, the Warrior, and the Bureaucrat, remained distinctly and definitely marked out; but it is an error to suppose, as some have imagined, that these castes were in any sense distinct races, raised from particular families, and then endowed with special offices in the state.

Duty of Prayer.—The following beautiful imitation of Plato is from *Sivan the Sleeper*, a charming work by the Rev. H. C. Adams.

"Surely," said he, "O Socrates, thou dost not mean that a man should not offer up prayer to the Blessed Ones! How could we reconcile that with what thou didst tell Euthydemus not many days since, that it was right to reverence the Deity by sacrifices and prayers, in that manner which the laws of the country wherein each man dwelleth may prescribe—or with thine own daily practice which is in strict conformity with this rule? How may this be, that we are to worship, yet to forbear from worship; to pray, yet to abstain from prayer?"

"It is indeed a difficult question, my Xenophon," said Socrates, "yet let us examine it more attentively. Was it not said that we had better desist from praying, because we knew not what would be good for us to petition for?"

"It was," said Xenophon.

"But are we thus ignorant as to what may be the effect of all things that a man may receive, or only of some? Thus, for instance, do we not know that virtue is better than vice, and knowledge than ignorance, and content than disquietude of mind?"

"It is true, we do know these things."

"It must be better for us, then, to acquire virtue rather than vice, and knowledge than ignorance, and truth than falsehood?"

"Certainly."

"Then, since we know that it must be good for us to receive these things, we need not fear to entreat the gods to give them to us?"

"It appears reasonable to think so," said Xenophon.

"But tell me again, my Xenophon, how do we know this? How do we know that truth is better than falsehood, and virtue than vice, and the like?"

"Thou teachest us," replied Xenophon, "that it is by contemplation and study of the divine nature that we come to know these things; which are indeed written on our souls, but the hand-writing being overlaid with dirt and rubbish, the soul hath need to be cleansed and purified by contemplation and self-mastery, so that the writing may be the more clearly discerned."

"Right," said Socrates; "the more then that we learn of the divine nature, the more things shall we know of, that are of a certainty good for man to possess, and which he may safely ask for."

"Even so, as it appears to me," was the answer.

"Such, then," said Socrates, "do I account to be the nature of prayer. Whatsoever things we know to be certainly and immutably good we may rightly ask the Blessed One to bestow upon us. They are, indeed, the same things that the Gods, if they were pleased with us, would bestow upon us, whether we asked them or not; yet doubtless the more for our asking. But to pray for such things as the vulgar petition for, such as riches, or power, or prosperity in any undertaking, or a life longer than that of other men, or exempt from the ordinary conditions of humanity; such prayers I account as folly, nay, by Jupiter, as approaching to madness!"

Sivan had stood by while this dialogue proceeded, so deeply interested, that he had almost forgotten that his name and person were unknown to the philosopher. But the last remark brought his own peculiar case so directly home to him, and in a light so unfavourable, that he could not remain silent.

"Pardon me, O wise Socrates," he said, stepping forward from behind Ariston's seat; "but if the Deity be such as thou describest him, would he suffer his gifts to be hurtful to those unto whom he grants them? Is it not in his power to make a thing profitable or injurious at his pleasure; and may he not, therefore, make anything which thou or I may ask for, beneficial rather than hurtful to us?"

Socrates looked in some surprise at the youthful speaker: and Ariston hastened to interpose. "He is my nephew," he said, "Antipho, the son of Menexenus, who yesterday returned to Athens after an absence of many years. It was my purpose in coming hither to-day to ask thee to admit him among the number of thy disciples; as he is anxious to make up, so far as he may, for the time he hath lost during his residence among the barbarians of Macedonia and Thrace."

Socrates bent his head graciously. "I reject none who are anxious to seek after divine philosophy; and I doubt not that the son of Menexenus and nephew of Ariston will be an apt pupil. For thy question, noble youth, remember that there are things hurtful in themselves, as excessive pleasure, or success, which of necessity injure those who receive them; and other things, which if granted to one man must needs hurt another; as if it be granted to one man to slay his enemy, it must be destruction to him who is slain. And again, have we not already mentioned certain persons who did receive that which they prayed for; yet it proved not advantageous but hurtful to them?"

"But hath not the Deity," replied Sivan, "power to cause even what is evil in its own nature to become good to any one, if he so will it; and so, again, if he

choose it, to arrange the order of events, that he that slays and he that is slain shall both receive benefit? And for those of whom thou hast spoken, as Midas and Gyges, might it not be that the fruition of their wishes was injurious to them, because they prayed not in a reverent and submissive spirit; which if they had done, the obtaining their desires would not have proved their ruin?"

Socrates looked at him with increasing interest. "It may be so," he said, thoughtfully, "but it seems to me that we know not, as yet, enough of the divine nature to speak certainly of these matters. Even the wisest of men, or they that are called so, know little more than their own ignorance of such things. And until they be more fully enlightened respecting them, it were safest at least to abstain from such prayers as thou speakest of."

"It is well said," remarked Xenophon; "but tell me, if such a revelation of the nature of the Gods be needful, whence it is to arise, and who is he that shall instruct mankind therein; for, as it seems to me, no man is able to do this?"

"I am not able to say," replied the philosopher, "for my own part I nothing doubt that such a revelation will at some future time be bestowed. For as on the one hand, I am persuaded that God is full of love and care for men, and on the other that no gift can be conferred upon them so excellent as that of knowledge of the divine nature, I cannot question but that they will one day be instructed therein; but as regards the time when, or the source whence, the teacher may arise, I am not able to say anything. But the afternoon is wearing fast away, and it is time that we return to the city. Noble Ariston, I will walk with thee, for there are many things concerning which I would fain make inquiry."

The Basques.—At the Ethnological Society, June 10th, Mr. Tolmé read a paper "On the researches of Wilhelm von Humboldt on the ancient inhabitants of Spain." Mr. Tolmé said that it was well known that there existed under the Spanish crown a district, in which the character of the people, as well as their language and government, were in striking contrast with those of the rest of the monarchy. This people was very little known in England, and he thought that it would be serviceable to ethnology to make known in this country the opinions of Wilhelm von Humboldt concerning them, of whose little book it was proposed to print a translation under the auspices of the Society. The early history of the Basques is as obscure as their position and character are anomalous. They preserved their rude independence from Goths and Moors, and it was not till late in the fourteenth century that they became incorporated with the crown of Spain, under which, as a lordship, they have since continued. They have still preserved much of their old liberties, and continue to talk their ancient language, in spite of the efforts of the Government during many years to abolish it. It was the opinion of Humboldt that the modern Basques are the representatives of the ancient Iberians, and that they were the original inhabitants of the whole of Spain. He deduces this opinion from a comparison of the component parts of the ancient names of places as preserved to us by the Roman historians and geographers, and which he alleges are clearly taken from the Basque language. A mixture of Celts with this original race formed that part of the ancient population of Spain which was called the Celtiberians. He considered that the Iberians, or Basques, had been gradually driven from the rest of the peninsula by the progress of conquest, until they were no longer to be found beyond the limits of the present Basque provinces. Mr. Tolmé gave a clear and sufficiently comprehensive *résumé* of the researches and arguments of Wilhelm von Humboldt on these various points. In the discussion which followed the reading of this paper, Mr. James Kennedy said that, having studied the Basque language for some years, he had come to a different conclusion from that of Humboldt. He believed the Basques to be descendants of some small colony in Spain, and not of the original inhabitants of the whole peninsula. They had many words in their language, and many customs, which were common to the ancient peoples of the east; such, for instance, as that alluded to in the book of Ruth, of the next of kin having the right of preemption in the sale of landed property, which still prevails among the Basques; they had also a

curious enactment among their laws, or *fueros*, that every priest might have two wives, of which privilege, though Roman Catholics, they were said to avail themselves, and places for the two wives were set apart in the old churches. Although their language was said by Dr. Latham and others to be one *sui generis*, he had found many words in it in common with Coptic, Syriac, and other languages of the east. It was to be regretted that we had no work in the English language on the subject of this people, and on their language and origin, and he thought that the Society would do a service in publishing a translation of Humboldt's work. He rejoiced to see that public attention had been turned towards the Basques recently, especially by the labours of Prince Louis Lucien Bonaparte, whom he saw present, and to whose valuable efforts to preserve the fading remembrances of Basque traditions, he could not refer without expressing satisfaction that a member of the present imperial dynasty of France was so worthily engaged in promoting useful knowledge. The Prince Louis Bonaparte made some remarks on our present knowledge of the history and condition of the Basques. He confirmed the statement of Mr. Kennedy relating to the two wives of the Basque priests. With regard to the language, he said that it was entirely lost in one province, Alava; in Guipuscoa it continued to be the universal language of the people; in the other provinces it prevailed only partially. To shew the gradual manner in which the language was disappearing, he instanced one parish in which it is customary to preach a sermon in Basque once a year for the sake of the old people. In reply to a question, the prince gave some explanation of the principles upon which he is constructing an elaborate linguistic map, and of the progress he had made in it.

Council of Trent.—A valuable work on the History of the Council of Trent is about to be brought out in Rome, under the auspices of Pius IX. Padre Theiner, the editor and compiler, has been for many years the prefect of the secret archives of the Vatican, and in his official situation has had full and free access to all the MSS. During many years he has privately worked out his history of the Council, and has amassed an enormous number of documents on the subject. In the revolutionary period at Rome, fearing that the original codices might be destroyed or removed from his keeping, he caused facsimiles of the autograph signatures of the fathers to be engraved in copperplate. At the instigation of Monsignor Roscovani, the bishop of Waitzen, who was in Rome seeking for materials for a scientific work, Padre Theiner sought an audience of the Pope, and begged permission to publish his work, detailing all his secret labour, and at the same time asserting that he had never intended to send the book forth into the world without the full authority and sympathy of the church. The Pope referred the matter to a commission of learned and pious men, who, without a dissentient voice, declared themselves in favour of the work. The result is, that the Pope has consented to its publication, and added ten thousand scudi to aid in the project, and besides has re-instituted the famous printing-press of the Vatican, which will commence its new life with Padre Theiner's *Complete History of the Council of Trent*, and with the publication of all the original documents which have been so long kept from vulgar gaze among the countless MSS. of the Vatican. The first part will appear in three folio volumes, containing the complete diary of the Council as it was arranged by Signor Mas. sarelli, the secretary, and signed by the fathers themselves; also the acts of the Council, from its formation on the 13th December, 1545, to its close on the 4th December, 1563, with all the disputes, controversies, and correspondence during that time. These acts are now for the first time presented to the world in an unmutilated form. The second part, also in three folio volumes, will consist of documents relating to the Council, which are not actually official, but at the same time necessary to its history. Signor Theiner has, during the time occupied in setting up the Vatican press, made a journey to Trent to examine the fifty-two volumes of documents relating to the Council, which are preserved in the Mazzetti library.—*Literary Gazette.*

Glasgow Cathedral Painted Windows.—The Committee appointed to carry

into effect the object of the subscribers of all denominations in Glasgow, to erect painted windows throughout the ancient cathedral in that city, have just published their report. It is a document of considerable interest. There are forty-two windows, exclusive of the great east window subscribed by Government. The estimate of costs exhibits much variety of price. Those furnished from London, Paris, and Munich, carry the sum total to nearly 10,000*l*. The Dresden and Brussels estimates are a little over 6,000*l*. The estimate from Tours is exactly 5,359*l*. 18*s*. 6*d*. These sums relate merely to the artists' work. There are other expenses which will amount to a considerable sum total. The Committee have pronounced British glass-painters as incompetent to produce the result required; and the former body recommend the "Royal Factory at Munich" as the leading establishment, whose artists would accomplish all that is desired of them by the subscribers. With regard to the subjects, a very fair suggestion is made to divide them into illustrations of the old dispensation, episodes from Jewish history, subjects from the parables; others illustrative of the preaching of the Gospel to the nations, with figures of prophets, kings, and angels bearing scrolls of texts. It is proposed to select for the chapter-house windows subjects from the history of the cathedral. There is no reason to doubt that, by the system proposed, the artists, to be engaged under an intelligent director, will carry out a harmonious plan of decoration suitable to the character of the building, and worthy of the purity and dignity of its architecture. It is to be hoped that there will be no difficulty touching the subjects. We have a grateful respect for the Reformation, but farewell to Art if we are to cease to be "catholic" in regard to *that*. It is highly creditable to Glasgow that no obstacle has arisen in this direction. We can conceive nothing so unlucky, for instance, as a proposal that, in choice of subjects, Protestantism is to be held peculiarly in view. If such a proposal were to be adopted no artist would have fair play, and the glorious old cathedral would be worse treated than the artist. We rejoice, too, in the liberality that takes the Committee to the most accomplished artists, irrespective of cost or country. Our native glass-painters may surpass them in execution, but they are inferior in design and composition. They will not be content to remain thus inferior, for there are young English artists full of promise, and to these the sight of Glasgow Cathedral as it will appear in its one soul-subduing harmony of light, colour, tone, and architectural effect, will touch the intellect of the student as it will the heart of the worshipper—with profit to both.—*Athenæum*.

Embalmmment of Edward I.—The king came to Lanercost about the last day of September, 1306, and remained there throughout October, November, December, and through January and February in the following year. In the commencement of March he went to Carlisle, staying there until the 5th of July, which is the latest day the royal visits were attested, as he expired on the 7th in the immediate neighbourhood, at Burgh-on-Sands. He next adverted to the last days of the king, giving an account of his illness and sojourn in Lanercost. He then stated the following charges for medicines during Edward's illness, and the expenses of preparations for the king's embalmment, as they appear on the wardrobe accounts of the 34th and 35th years of his reign. We extract a few of the more interesting, and give them in English:—

"For an ointment of cicotrine aloes, made six times for the thighs of the king, 11*l*.—For another ointment of dry things with balsam, six ounces, 20 marcs.—For emulsions of aromatic flowers and herbs, 110*s*... For oil of wheat, 30*s*.; for oil of beech, 18*s*. For plasters, 4*l*.—For distilled oil of turpentine, 40*s*.—For one comforting electuary, with amber, and musk, and pearls, and jacinets of gold and pure silver, 8*l*. 8 marcs.—For a sweet drink sharpened with pearls and corals, four ounces, 5 marcs.—For warm fomentations, 16*lb*., 32*s*.—For oil of laurel, 8*lb*., 20*s*.—For rose-water of Damascus, 40*lb*., 4*l*.—For wine of pomegranates, 20*lb*., 60*s*.—For a plaster for the neck of the king, with ladanus and oriental amber, 60*s*.—For six ounces and a half of balsam for anointing the body of the king, 13*l*.—For aromatic powder of aloes, frankincense and myrrh, to place in the body of the king, 4*l*.—For three ounces of musk to put in the

nostrils of the king, 60s.—For oriental amber, to put in the food of the king and in clarets, 18oz., 18 marcs.—For 38 glisters, 40s.—For blessed oil, 12oz., 48s.—For castors' fat, 16oz., 48s.—For an ointment sharpened with castors' powder, and for fat of castor and enfer bean powder, 69s.—This ointment was made a second time for the king, with balsam and cicotrine aloes, 60s.—Also for one pretious electuary, which is called Dyatameron (or an antidote to fate), 12lb., 12 marcs."

These various ointments, emulsions, and fomentations, were applied to the royal body under the direction of Dr. Nicholas de Tyngewik, who was a physician held in the highest repute, and elsewhere described as a man of honest life, good conversation, and eminent science. Ten days after the king's death, we have the following curious inventory of, amongst others, these possessions:—"Arium factum, apud Burgum super Sabulonem. 17 die Julii, anno 35 Edw. I." Amongst the relics was a purse, containing a thorn from the crown of Christ, which was the Earl of Cornwall's; part of the wood of the Holy Cross, and many relics of the blessed Edward the Confessor; little bones from the head of St. Laurence; a bone of St. James of Galicia; part of the arm of St. Maurice; two fragments of bones of St. Blaise and St. Christine; a small bottle of silver, with milk of the blessed Virgin, mother of God, also part of the sponge which our Lord received; a tooth of a saint, efficacious against thunder and lightning; also a small purse, containing some of the vestment and hood of the blessed Virgin Mary and St. Gregory; one of the nails of the cross of our Lord and of the stone of the sepulchre; a great arm of silver-gilt, with relics of St. Thomas and St. Bartholomew, apostles; also a great bone from the arm of St. Osith; the arm of St. David; the arm of St. Richard of Leicester; the arm of St. William of York; more milk of the glorious Virgin Mary; a little silver ship, gilt, containing many bones of the 11,000 virgins. Amongst the usual Church furniture of the period was an auriculare ad evangelium, or custuris for the Gospel, and a painted tablet of wood, with an image, besides various articles of domestic use, formed of gold, silver, and silver-gilt, together with robes, gold rings, some of which had been presented to the king, and a Lichefrit or Leschesfriches of silver.—*From paper read at the Archæological Institute, by the Rev. C. Hartshorne.*

Jewish hatred to Christianity.—The following letter will shew our readers in what light the Jews view efforts for their conversion:—

"CONVERSION MANIA.—*To the Editor of the Jewish Chronicle,*—Dear Sir,—There are some nuisances which are periodical, Exeter-hall, for instance, among many; some are perennial, but break out with increased virulence now and then. Conversion is a nuisance of the latter class. No sooner does hoary winter display itself, with the ordinary concomitants of hunger, thirst, raggedness and destitution, then out pops conversion, Bible in one hand (open in any part of the New Testament), and substantial and invigorating physical comforts in the other. Tacitly the poor soul of the hungry is told, 'Take the one, you shall possess the other; discard the Book, you have no claim to the helping hand.' But the spider's web is not even thus so openly spread always for the poor fly; the tactics of a lady conversionist among our needy are otherwise. She preys upon the young, who are invited to a room, comfortable and snug, having lots (they report) of pictures on the walls, and 'we get such a nice tea.' They are told to say grace, quite after the orthodox fashion, and conversation ensues relative to the 'pretty pictures.' *Facilis descensus Averno.* No heed is first given to the New Testament, but how soon are our youthful minds led away? They are told to come again, and it is so nice that many promises are made to that effect. Dr. Adler, look to this; are our young to be thus ensnared? Parents, let me entreat you to interpose between your children and perdition. 'Baffle their efforts' is and should be the motto of every man whose heart beats with affection for Judaism.

"I am, Sir, yours respectfully,

"FORTITER IN RE VERSUS SUAVITER IN MODO."

Japan.—The proceedings of a Pagan sect—the religion of Sinto—which has under its rule forty millions of souls, cannot but be interesting to all readers. A letter of July 15, from Simoda, a port of Japan open to foreigners, gives an account which we subjoin:—

Independently of the Emperor, another personage in the vast empire of Japan is of first-rate importance—the Dai-ri, or supreme head of the religion of Sinto. He is regarded as a god on earth, who never dies, but who from time to time renovates his soul. The Dai-ri inhabits the city of Miyako, situated in the imperial island of Nippon. He possesses there a magnificent palace, and has a court of 22,000 priests, charged with the service of 4000 places of worship in that immense city. His dress is composed of a long white tunic, over which is a wide crimson robe, and he wears a white veil, trimmed with gold lace, the people never beholding his face. On July 1, the Dai-ri fell ill, and the High Priest was immediately called to the palace, with the sacerdotal college, composed of 200 priests of the first class. On the 3rd, the priests spread the news that the Dai-ri had placed himself in communication with the great gods of heaven, and was about to renew his soul in the bosom of Ten Sio Dai-Tsin, the highest of all these divinities. Prayers were ordered for the happy accomplishment of that solemn act, and when they had terminated, the priests announced that the people were about to be admitted to the palace to behold their venerated pontiff. The crowd hastened to the palace, where the Dai-ri was lying on an immense bed of state, with his robes on, and the gauze veil covering his face. The priests remained praying in turns in the midst of the burning perfumes and other practices of their religion. On the 5th July, at nine in the morning, the Dai-ri expired, and immediately after his breathing his last, the High Priest announced that the soul had gone to pay a visit to the gods, but would speedily return. A dead silence then succeeded; and at the end of about ten minutes, the High Priest, surrounded by the sacred college, threw a large white linen cloth over the body, and the moment afterwards withdrawing it, discovered to the eyes of the multitude another form altogether similar to that of the late Dai-ri, but full of life and health. This new head of the church then arose and proceeded to an altar placed at one side, ascended it, and gave his benediction to the multitude, who uttered shouts of joy. By a stratagem easily managed, the priests had substituted for the deceased Dai-ri the person of his son, his natural heir. A trap had let down one body, and raised the other. The corpse was removed from the palace the same night, and burned, and the ashes deposited in the hollow head of one of a range of bronze statues erected in the temple of Ycle to the highest god. On the 7th the new Dai-ri quitted his palace, surrounded by all the priests, and went through the various parts of the city in a grand triumphal car drawn by 100 white horses. Everywhere on his passage the people bowed down to the earth, as if a divinity was before them. On that day all work and business were suspended, the prisoners set at liberty, and all criminal proceedings annulled.

Patristic Literature.—The *Civiltà Cattolica* (July 18) gives a very interesting *résumé* of the labours of the Abbe Migne towards printing and publishing a complete Library of Patristic and Catholic Divinity at such a reasonable price as will enable the bulk of the clergy and laity to purchase either the whole or single works at their convenience. The *Bibliotheca Cleri Universa* is composed of upwards of two thousand volumes, handsomely printed in a medium quarto size, the price to subscribers being 7700 francs. More than half of this number is already in circulation, and the rest is in rapid progress of completion; as, from the Abbe's press issue, at present, several volumes during the month. The works are printed in double columns, in a clear type, but so compact that, in each volume, is contained at least two of the old folios. There are many notes, dissertations, and various readings; and, as the price of the new edition is, to subscribers, only five francs the volume, we may readily conceive the great advantage which is gained. Each author, or set of authors, comprised in one volume, may be obtained separately. The first portion of this great series is a complete Patrology, in the Latin Church, from the apostles to the era of Innocent

III., A.D. 1216; and, in the Greek Church up to the epoch of Fozio, A.D. 863. To the principal works indices are given to the number of two hundred; and the best editions have been followed. Upwards of six hundred smaller treatises and fragments have already been published for the first time. The whole will be concluded with a complete *Index Rerum*, and an *Index Sacræ Scripturæ*, both of the Old and New Testaments, noting every place where Holy Scripture is cited. This *Cursus Compleatus Patrologiæ* is in two divisions:—first, *Patrologia Latina*; and, secondly, *Patrologia Græca*. The *Patrologia Latina* is now complete in two hundred and twenty volumes, at the price of 1100 francs—each author or collection of authors forming one volume, to be sold separately. Amongst others, we note Tertullian, three vols., twenty francs; St. Hilary two vols., fourteen francs; St. Ambrose, four vols., twenty-eight francs; *Poetæ Christiani*, one vol., six francs; St. Jerome, nine vols., sixty francs; St. Augustine, sixteen vols., eighty francs; *Vitæ Patrum* auctore Rosweyde, two vols., fourteen francs; St. Gregory, five vols., fifty-five francs; Beda, six vols., forty-two francs; *Scriptores Seculi Septerni*, one vol., seven francs; St. Bernard, four vols., twenty-eight francs; Peter Lombard, two vols., fourteen francs, etc. etc. The Greek Patrology is in a twofold edition. The one is the Greek text with the Latin translation, and is to be comprised in a hundred volumes, of which thirty-six are already published. The price of these is to be eight hundred francs, and whoever pays this sum in advance may choose out of works published by Migne, an additional quantity to the value of ninety francs. The other edition, which has reached its eighteenth volume, is of the Latin translations only. Of the Greek Fathers we find St. Dionysius, two vols., sixteen francs; Justin, one vol., twelve francs; Clemens Alexandrinus, one vol., twenty-two francs; Origen, seven vols., seventy-five francs, etc. The second series consists of a selection of the commentaries on Holy Scripture in twenty-nine vols., for one hundred and forty-four francs. The third series is a selection from the Masters of Catholic Theology, in twenty-eight vols., for one hundred and thirty-eight francs. The fourth is the *Prompta Bibliotheca* of Ferraris, which contains a complete collection of canonists, jurists, moral, theological, ascetical, and rubrical writers; and is printed in eight volumes, at the price of sixty francs. Besides these, upwards of one hundred and twenty volumes of Lexicons, Prelections, Institutions, Ritual works, Hagio-graphy, Sacred Music, Ethnography, Rules and Histories of the Monastic Orders, Councils, the principal apologists of Christianity, Catechisms, Liturgies, Pilgrimages, etc., are added; and make the undertaking one of the most extraordinary literary achievements of modern times.

Chevalier Bunsen is preparing a new German translation of the Bible. The work is to consist of three sections, in seven volumes, and the publication will begin towards the end of this year, at Leipsic. The first section, comprising four volumes, will be entitled, "Die Bibel, oder die Schriften der Alten und Neuen Bunder, nach den überlieferten Grundtexten volksmässig, und treu übersetzt und für die christliche Gemeinde erklärt." The second section, in two volumes, is to bear the title: "Bibel-Urkunden, oder die Schriften der Alten und Neuen Bunder, geschichtlich und nach des Zeitfolge geordnet und für die Gemeinde erklärt." The third and last section, in one volume, is entitled: "Bibel und Weltgeschichte, oder das Leben Jesu und das ewige Reich Gottes."

OBITUARY.

DR. DICK.

ON the 29th of July, at Broughton Ferry, Dundee, the Rev. Thos. Dick, LL.D., F.R.A.S., etc.

Thomas Dick was born in the Hilltown, Dundee, on the 24th of November, 1774; his father being Mungo Dick, a small linen manufacturer, and a member of the Secession Church, by whom he was brought up with the exemplary care common amongst Christian parents in Scotland in those times. As early as his ninth year he is said to have had his mind turned to astronomical studies by the appearance of a remarkable meteor. His father intended to bring him up to the manufacturing business; but a severe attack of small-pox, followed by measles, greatly weakened his constitution, and probably confirmed his own wish for mental rather than manual exertion; so that, although set to the loom, having gotten possession of a small work on astronomy, it became his constant companion, even while plying the shuttle. His curiosity to see the planets described in the book led him to contrive a machine for grinding a series of lenses, and by the help of a pasteboard tube, he made for himself a telescope. The lad with the telescope came to be regarded as the Astronomer Royal of the neighbourhood, although his thrifty friends shook their heads, thought he was moon-struck, and feared that star-gazing would not find him bread. They wisely, however gave way to his inclination, and at the age of sixteen he became an assistant teacher in one of the schools at Dundee, and began to prepare himself for the University of Edinburgh, which he entered as a student in his twentieth year, supporting himself by private teaching. At this period he began to contribute essays to various publications, and was preparing himself for the works which were afterwards to give him a name, and make him more conspicuously useful to his fellow men. In 1801 he was licensed to preach in the Secession Church, and officiated for some years in different parts of Scotland; at last, however, he settled for ten years as teacher of the Secession School at Methven, where he experimented as to the practicability of teaching sciences to adults; established a people's library; and may be said to have founded the first mechanics' institute in the kingdom—a number of years before the name was applied to it. For ten years more he taught at Perth, where he wrote the *Christian Philosopher*, which at once and deservedly became a favourite work, and in a short time ran through several editions. The success of that work induced him to resign his position as a teacher, and retire to Broughton-Ferry, near Dundee, where, in the fifty-third year of his age, he established himself in a neat little cottage on the hill, to the astonishment of the villagers at the time, who looked with wonder upon his observatory, and speculated greatly on his reasons for dwelling so much above them. From that time until within the last few years, when the chill of age stayed his hand, his pen was ever busy preparing the numerous works in which, under different forms and by various methods, he not only, as an American divine has said, brought down philosophy from heaven to earth, but raised it from earth to heaven. Dr. Dick never claimed to be a discoverer, an inventor, or a learned theologian; yet he has done immense service both to service and religion. The hard facts which he gathered in the abstruse and recondite pages of strictly scientific men—the dry bones of science, so to speak—became vivified in his mind, and were presented in his interesting pages with a living beauty of expression that charmed every reader. There was nothing of the pedagogue in his style; he did not adhere to the formula of scientific demonstration; but beginning from topics of common interest, he went on to state views which, though not new to learned men, were new to the bulk of his readers; and he did this in language so nervous, with illustrations so graphic, and with a spirit so genial, that all who read were won with admiration. Our conviction is, that his works stand unequalled amongst the publications of the time as antidotes to popular scepticism, by giving Christian views of the great facts of nature and the profound problems of life, without either the offence of dogmatism or the tediousness of theological argument.

The spirit that breathes through his works is not harsh, censorious, and uncharitable, but the true spirit of religion—kind, generous, and loving. Were religious books more commonly written so, it would not be said that they were dull; and were scientific books more frequently written so, it would not be said that they were irreligious. They indeed justify the title justly ascribed to him, every page attesting the authorship both of the Christian and the philosopher.—*Dundee Advertiser*.

THE VERY REV. DEAN CONYBEARE, F.R.S.

On the 12th of August, at Itchenstoke, near Portsmouth, aged seventy, the Very Rev. William Daniel Conybeare, M.A., F.R.S., Dean of Llandaff.

He was born June 7, 1787, and was the son of a clergyman, who was Rector of Bishopsgate, whose father, the Rev. John Conybeare, D.D., was Dean of Christ Church, and afterwards Bishop of Bristol. Bishop Conybeare was the author of various theological works, and of sermons of no inconsiderable repute. The elder brother of the late Dean, the Rev. John Josias Conybeare, who was born in 1779, had attained great distinction, and had given proof of the possession of no ordinary abilities, when his death took place in 1824, at a comparatively early age, and in the full maturity of his powers. He was a student of Christchurch, and gained the Chancellor's prize for a Latin poem on the subject of *Religio Brahmæ*, in the year 1801. Afterwards he was appointed Professor of Anglo-Saxon and of Poetry in his University, and read the Bampton Lecture in 1824. His work on Anglo-Saxon poetry, edited by his brother after his death, is one of great learning, and of the highest value to the student of the language, being full of illustrations drawn from varied sources of ancient and recondite literature. He contributed also to the *Annals of Philosophy*, and to the *Transactions of the Geological Society*; but his papers are confined chiefly to the geology of Clovelly, in Devon, and to memoranda of fossils and mineral veins in Cornwall. At his death he was Vicar of Batheaston, in Somersetshire, and Prebendary of York. Of his elder brother the late Dean was accustomed to speak in terms of the highest reverence and most affectionate regard; always attributing his own attainment to his assistance and example. The younger brother was educated first at Westminster, and afterwards at Christchurch. There, in the year 1808, he is well known to have taken a first class in classics, and a second in mathematics; his associates in the former rank being Dr. Ashurst Gilbert, the present Bishop of Chichester, the late Sir Robert Peel, and two others. Sir Robert Peel was alone in the first class in mathematics; but in the second, along with Conybeare and four others, is to be found the name of Archbishop Whately. Being thus a contemporary of the late Prime Minister, the late Dean of Llandaff was not wholly unacquainted with the private views of so distinguished a member of his University; and, aided by these recollections, he used to express no surprise at the liberal measures which Sir Robert Peel gradually advocated, having always, he used to say, considered him to be a Whig at heart.

It must have been shortly after taking his degree at Oxford that he entered upon the pursuit of geology, the science with which his name is inseparably connected. In the year 1814 his first communication was made to the *Transactions of the Geological Society*, of which body, we believe, he was one of the earliest members, if not an actual founder. Into the study of the then new science he entered with the utmost ardour, as an associate of Buckland and Phillips, and encouraged, as we have said, by the example of his brother. His first paper in the *Geological Transactions* is a tract on the origin of a remarkable class of organic impressions occurring in the nodules of flint, in the course of which he establishes that these substances are not, as was supposed, fossil corals, but produced by the infiltration of silicious matter into shells, the calcareous matrix of which has since perished. On the 5th April, 1816, he read a paper, "On the Geological Features of the North-East Coast of Ireland," extracted from the notes of J. F. Berger, M.D., which had been read before the Society two years previously, on the 15th April, 1814. This treatise, which was afterwards published in a separate form, displays Mr. Conybeare's admirable power of

combining a delineation of the general features of a district with an enumeration of its minute details. In the same volume is to be found also a "Descriptive Note referring to the Outline of Sections presented by a Part of the Coast of Antrim and Derry." This paper was collected from joint observations made by himself and Dr. Buckland during a tour in Ireland in the summer of 1813. Reference was lately made to this treatise by the president of the Geological Society, in his Anniversary Address of February last. A disputed question respecting the constitution of certain porcellanic schistous rock, full of ammonites, at Portrush, was considered to have been set at rest by the investigations on this occasion. The structure of this rock had been brought forward as evidence to shew that basaltic rocks generally had been in a state of aqueous solution or suspension. "The observations of the Rev. W. D. Conybeare," says Col. Portlock, "and of the Rev. W. Buckland, strengthened the opinion of Playfair, by shewing that these indurated strata were by their organic contents related to the strata of the adjacent county." (*Anniversary Address*, 25th February, 1857, p. xxx.) At this period, the discoveries of new marvels in geology were matters of monthly occurrence; the remains of one large animal had been discovered and arranged, and had been styled by Mr. König, of the British Museum, "*Ichthyosaurus*;" when Mr. Conybeare, in examining the collections that had been formed by Col. Birch, at Bristol, of fossil remains taken from the lias in the vicinity of that city, came upon some bones which were taken at first to be those of the crocodile. Further inspection, however, satisfied him that the resemblance to the skeleton of a crocodile was only an analogy, and not an identity of genus. In conjunction with Mr. De la Beche, the matter was fully investigated, and a memoir was drawn up and read before the Geological Society, announcing the discovery of the new animal, on the 6th of April, 1821. Hitherto nothing but dislocated fragments had been discovered, amongst which was a mutilated head, in the possession of Mr. Thomas Clarke, from the lias of Street, near Glastonbury; but Mr. Conybeare's skill in comparative anatomy was sufficient to enable him to construct the entire skeleton, and from the circumstance of the animal approaching *more nearly* to the nature of a crocodile than to that of an *Ichthyosaurus*, it was called by its present name of *Plesiosaurus*.

At the close of this paper, the writer, with a delicacy peculiarly his own, after appealing to the hearers' indulgence on the ground of the nature of the subject, and his own inexperience in the branch of science to which it related, and after felicitously quoting a maxim of Scarpa, "*Usque adeo natura, una eadem semper atque multiplex, disparibus etiam formis affectus pares admirabili quiddam varietatum simplicitate conciliat*"—concludes as follows:—"I need not add how much these difficulties will be increased in the hands of a writer who must acknowledge, that whilst intruding upon the province of comparative anatomy, he stands on foreign ground; and using, as it were, a foreign language, is frequently driven to adopt an awkward periphrasis, where a single word from the pen of a master would probably have been sufficient." When, shortly afterwards, a more complete specimen came into the possession of the Duke of Buckingham, a second paper was read on the subject in May, 1822; and, finally, from a still more perfect skeleton, found at Lyme, all the early theories were verified, and a complete description was delivered on the 20th February, 1824. The discoveries confirmed Mr. Conybeare's conjectural restorations to a remarkable degree of nicety. This achievement has always been considered a great triumph for British science, and is ranked by Dr. Buckland as not inferior to the performances of Cuvier himself, who asserted of the *Plesiosaurus*, that its structure was the most heteroclite, and its character altogether the most monstrous that had been found amid the ruins of an ancient world. In later years we have witnessed still more brilliant triumphs of science in the restorations of Professor Owen. About the same period, Messrs. Buckland and Conybeare laid before the Geological Society, "*Observations on the S. W. Coal District of England*," with respect to which it will again be sufficient to cite the authority of Colonel Portlock. Speaking of this treatise, he says, "At the present moment we can hardly estimate the true value of such elaborate papers, or the vast labour of collecting the data for completing them; entering, as we now do, upon our inquiries after these early pioneers of science have shaped out a course for us, and enabled us to pass easily over ground which to them was full of difficulties."

Mr. Conybeare completed his geological labours by the publication, in conjunction with Mr. W. Phillips, of a work of greater importance than any of the preceding, in the year 1822. This was the *Outlines of the Geology of England and Wales*, founded upon a small treatise published by Phillips in 1818, called a *Selection of Facts*, etc. The greater part of this elaborate and comprehensive work, a marvel of compilation for its day, was written by Mr. Conybeare. It has often been referred to as the most useful manual on the subject ever published. The introduction was also written by Mr. Conybeare, who introduces a brief consideration of the points upon which geology was supposed to conflict with the Mosaic narrative of the creation, with respect to the Noachian deluge, and the antiquity of the earth. These subjects he pursued still further in a series of articles in the *Christian Observer*, at a time when the discoveries of geology engrossed the attention of the religious world; and a few articles in the *Edinburgh Review* of this period were contributed by him.

Mr. Conybeare was for many years rector of Sully, in Glamorganshire. In 1831 he was elected Visitor of Bristol College, and during that and two following years he delivered a series of lectures at the college, which were afterwards published accompanied by an "Inaugural Address on the Application of Classical and Scientific Education to Theology." The peculiar interest which he imparted to these subjects by the original mould in which the materials were cast, the glowing enthusiasm with which the intellectual and poetical features of his theme were seized and upheld to the admiration of his hearers, and the charms of a copious and eloquent style, gave these lectures an unusual popularity.

In 1836 Mr. Conybeare was instituted to the vicarage of Axminster, Devon, of which rectory he was lessee from two prebendaries of York. He thus became personally connected with the town that was the birth-place of his friend and collaborator, the late Dean of Westminster. In 1839 he was appointed Bampton Lecturer to the University of Oxford. The lecture is published, being *An Analytical Examination into the Character, Value, and Just Application of the Ante-Nicene Fathers*. In 1847, at the instance of Dr. Coplestone, then Bishop, he was instituted to the Deanery of Llandaff, resigning the living of Axminster in favour of his eldest son. His eleven years' residence at the last-mentioned town was marked by large benefactions to the local charities, and by a constant exhibition of generosity, beneficence, and kindness, which have endeared his memory to the inhabitants. During his residence in this part of the country, the remarkable occurrence of the large landslip between Lyme and Exmouth took place, in the winter of 1839, which called forth a geological memoir from the Vicar of Axminster, accompanying several admirable drawings of the scene by W. Dawson, Mrs. Buckland and others. Mr. Conybeare was also a contributor to the *West of England Journal of Science and Literature*, and probably to other periodical works. His geological tastes were gratified also by a visit to the island of Teneriffe, about the year 1851 or 1852. His later years were understood to have been actively devoted to the superintendence of the repairs of Llandaff Cathedral, which have been so admirably carried out under the guidance of Mr. Seddon. He married a Miss Rankin, by whom he had six sons and a daughter. The eldest son, the Rev. W. J. Conybeare, who was fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, and the well-known writer, in conjunction with Mr. Howson, of the *Life of St. Paul*, Edinburgh Essayist, author of *Perversion*, etc., predeceased his father by a few months only. The loss of his son is said to have led to the dissolution of the venerable Dean; and those by whom the generous warmth of his affections and his acute sensibilities are remembered, will readily believe that such a result was only too probable. When, however, the remembrance of the charm of his peculiar and original character will have passed away, his name will remain as one of the most eminent in the career of discovery which ushered in the beginning of the nineteenth century.—*Gentleman's Magazine*.

BISHOP BLOMFIELD.

DR. BLOMFIELD, who retired from the bishopric of London at the close of last year, died at Fulham on Wednesday, August 5th, from the effects of an epileptic attack. He

was born on the 29th of May, 1786, at Bury St. Edmund's. He received his earliest education from his father, who conducted a school in that town. But it was at the grammar school of his native place, where he remained from the age of eight till he reached his eighteenth year, that he gained the rudiments of that scholarship which afterwards secured for him at Cambridge the distinctions of Third Wrangler, Senior Medallist, and a Fellowship at Trinity College, having previously obtained Sir William Brown's gold medal for the Latin and the Greek Ode. Although the rapid succession of these high academical honours seemed merely to designate him for the position of a sound and accurate classical scholar, which his earliest publications, indeed, fully maintained, it was to the ministry of the Church of England that he soon devoted the whole vigour of his abilities, and a wide sphere of growing usefulness was soon opened to him. Presented successively by the present Marquis of Bristol, who has been spared to survive the eminent *protégé* of his early life, and by the second Earl Spencer, to the livings of Quennington and Dunton, he was after five years preferred by the former to the Rectory of Chesterford, in the diocese over which he was afterwards destined for so long a period to preside. The see of London was at that time filled by Dr. Howley, who having in 1817 appointed Mr. Blomfield his domestic chaplain, and subsequently given him the living of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate, and the archdeaconry of Colchester, he was within a short interval elevated to the Bishopric of Chester before he had reached the age of 38.

It was in that high office, and still more when, after another brief period of four years, he succeeded his patron, Dr. Howley, in the see of London, that he displayed the full maturity of those talents which, during the last quarter of a century, made him the most conspicuous member of the English prelacy. As a debater in Parliament, whenever the interests of religion or the welfare of the clergy called him to share in its discussions, he was vigorous and lucid. As a preacher he combined the clearest statements of doctrinal truth with the most forcible and affectionate deductions from them of practical conduct, all clothed in a simplicity of language which made him equally acceptable to the most cultivated and the most ill-educated of his hearers; while the admirable management of a voice naturally melodious enabled him, without the least apparent effort, to command the attention of the largest congregations. There was an utter, and probably a studied, absence of all action in his public elocution, whether in the senate or the pulpit; the effects of it could only be attributable to the genuine sincerity of his character and to the sterling weight of the statements which he enforced. As an overlooker of the clergy of this populous diocese, he evinced the most marvellous power of dispatching business, whether it referred to the minutest or the gravest questions, and he was accessible at all times to every one who submitted them to his notice. The disposal of his ample preferment was never prostituted to the objects of nepotism, nor to the bias of political opinion. And if he retained the revenues of a most richly endowed see long after more recently appointed prelates had acquiesced in the limitation of theirs, it was only that he might with an unsparing hand promote the erection of churches, the funds of schools, and the provision for the poorer clergy. It was this large and self-denying munificence that mainly intended to stimulate the same spirit in others, and which has stamped upon his age of the English Church, amid all its unhappy divisions, a character unknown to it in any other. There are two measures, however, which bear upon them pre-eminently the impress of Bishop Blomfield's energetic mind—the systematic perseverance of his efforts to secure the building of churches and the extension of the colonial episcopate from five to thirty-one sees, which originated in the appeal of his well-known letter to Archbishop Howley. The improved residences of the beneficed and the improved stipends of the unbeneficed clergy, the more effective examinations of candidates for the ministry, and the greater frequency of communions and confirmations,—these were all evidences of a more vigorous ecclesiastical administration, which he might be thought to have shared with his episcopal contemporaries. But it would not probably be difficult to prove that even these were attributable in no ordinary degree to the impulse of his mind, which encouraged and stimulated others in the path of their responsible duty. True it is, indeed, that the controversial spirit diffused over the later period of Bishop Blomfield's life rendered more difficult the course of one who, like him, wished to think well of

all without truckling to the mistaken opinions of any. But those will be the first to make allowance for his conduct in dealing with the difficulties which such a state of opinion created, who estimate the delicate position of a prelate who is called upon to arbitrate at a moment when party spirit runs high among the clergy.

It would, however, be doing little justice to the character of so eminent a man if we were to drop the curtain over his memory without unfolding one portion of it, to delineate the consistency with which he adorned all the relations of domestic life. The best friends of his school and college career were those of his ripest years. With a memory accurate and retentive, and with an elastic cheerfulness of disposition, which the severest trials of arduous engagements and often ill-requited kindness never ruffled, the store of his reading and the fund of his anecdotes diffused a charm over the society of every circle which he entered. The father of a numerous family, of which six sons and five daughters are now deploring his loss, he laboured unceasingly to train them in the principles of the faith which from his heart he loved, and of which his own conduct afforded them a constant example. We have heard, upon an authority which cannot be questioned, that since his retirement into private life there were no sentiments flowing more frequently from his lips than those which expressed the conviction of his own inadequate fulfilment of his public duties; while the enjoyment of his mental faculties was preserved to him nearly to the close of his existence, and his last act of consciousness was an act of prayer.

The following list of Dr. Blomfield's published works was corrected by himself:—*Poema (Ode Latina in obitum mæstissimum Ducis D'Enghein)*, 8vo, Camb. 1805; *Poema in Curia Cantabrigiensi recitatum*; *Poema (Ode Græca) Mors Nelsoni*, 8vo, ib. 1806; *Æschyli Prometheus*, 8vo, ib. 1810, 7th Edit. 1840; *Æschyli Sept. e Thebas, Æschyli Persæ*, 8vo, ib. 1814, 5th Edit. 1840; *The Responsibility of the Pastoral Office* (a Visitation Sermon), 4to, Lond. 1815; *The Peculiar Claims which the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge has upon the Liberality of Churchmen* (a Sermon), 8vo, Camb. 1817; *Dissertation on the Traditional Knowledge of a promised Redeemer which subsisted before the Advent of Our Saviour*, 8vo, ib. 1819; *The Importance of Learning to the Clergy* (a Sermon), 4to, ib. 1820; *The Connection between the Natural Inconveniences and Moral Advantages of the Insular State; A Sermon, preached before the Corporation of the Trinity House*, 4to, ib. 1821; *Five Lectures on the Gospel of St. John, as bearing Testimony to the Divinity of our Saviour*, 12mo, ib. 1823; *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Archdeaconry of Colchester at Archdeacon Blomfield's Primary Visitation*, 4to, ib. 1823; *A Sermon, preached at the Anniversary Meeting of the Stewards of the Sons of the Clergy*, 4to, ib. 1823; *Æschyli Choephoræ*, 8vo, Camb. 1824, 3rd Edit. Lond. 1834; *A Charge, delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of Chester at Bishop Blomfield's Primary Visitation*, 4to, ib. 1825; *A Letter to Charles Butler, Esq. of Lincoln's Inn, in Vindication of English Protestants, from his Attack in the Book of "The Roman Catholic Church,"* 8vo, ib. 1825; *Callimachi quæ supersunt; Sophronis Fragmenta, in the "Classical Journal;" Sapphonis Fragmenta, in the "Museum Criticum;" Alcæi Fragmenta, do.*; *A Sermon, preached before the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel* (published in the Report of the year), 8vo, ib. 1827; *A Sermon, in Aid of the Societies for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and for the Propagation of the Gospel*, 8vo, ib. 1827; *Twelve Lectures on the Acts of the Apostles, with Five Lectures on the Gospel of St. John*, 8vo, 1828; *The Christian's Duty towards Criminals* (a Sermon), 4to, 1828; *Sermons, preached in the Parish Church of Botolph, Bishopsgate*, 8vo, ib. 1829; *A Sermon, preached before King William IV. at the Chapel Royal*, 4to, ib. 1830; *A Letter, on the present neglect of the Lord's Day, addressed to the Inhabitants of London and Westminster*, 8vo, ib. 1830; *A Manual of Family Prayers*, 8vo, ib. 1831, 2nd Edit. 18mo; *A Sermon, preached at the Opening of King's College, London*, 8vo, Lond. 1831; *The Coronation Sermon of King William IV.*, 4to, ib. 1831; *First Questions on Religion*, 1832; *The Use of a Standing Ministry, and an Established Church* (Two Sermons), 8vo, ib. 1834; *A Charge*, 8vo, ib. 1834; *Proposals for the Creation of a Fund to be applied to the Building and Endowment of additional Churches in the Metropolis*, 8vo, ib. 1836; *National Education (A Sermon in behalf of the National Society)*, 8vo, ib. 1838; *The Coronation Sermon*

of her Majesty the Queen, 4th edit. 8vo, ib. 1838; *A Charge*, 8vo, ib. 1838; *Speech on National Education, at Willis's Rooms*, 8vo, ib. 1839; *Æschyli Agamemnon*, 5th edit. 1839; *Speech in the House of Lords, on the Government Plan of National Education*, 8vo, ib. 1839; *Speech on the Ecclesiastical Duties and Revenue Bill*, 8vo, ib. 1840; *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury upon the Formation of a Fund for Endowing additional Colonial Bishoprics*, 8vo, ib. 1840; *Three Sermons on the Church*, 2 edits. 8vo, ib. 1842; *A Charge*, 8vo, ib. 1842; *The Manifestation of the Spirit* (a Sermon), 8vo, ib. 1842; *The Light of the World* (a Sermon), 4 edits. 8vo, ib. 1842; *God's Ancient People not Cast Away* (a Sermon preached before the Society for Promoting Christianity amongst the Jews), 8vo, ib. 1843; the articles on *Socrates*, and *The Chorus in Ancient Tragedy*, in "The Encyclopædia Metropolitana;" *A Charge*, 2 edits. 8vo, ib. 1846; *A Pastoral Letter to the Clergy of the Diocese of London*, 8vo, ib. 1847; *A Charge*, 2 edits. 8vo, ib. 1850; *A Sermon* (preached at Bury St. Edmund's), 8vo, ib. 1850; *Speech on the Second Reading of the Ecclesiastical Courts' (Appeal) Bill*, 8vo, ib. 1850; *The Church in Africa* (a Sermon), 8vo, ib. 1852; *The Mourning of Israel* (a Sermon), 8vo, ib. 1852.—*Clerical Journal*.

NEW WORKS PUBLISHED DURING THE LAST QUARTER.

In addition to those noticed in the body of the Journal.

FOREIGN.

Bernstein (G. H.)—*Lexicon Syriacum. Pars I.* Berlin. 4to.

Bock.—*Geschichte der Liturgischer Gewänder des Mittelalters: oder Entstehung und Entwicklung der Kirchlichen Ornate und Paramente, in Rücksicht auf Stoff, Gewebe, Farbe, Zeichnung, Schnitt, und rituelle Bedeutung nachgewiesen, und durch 110 Abbildungen in Farbendruck erläutert, von Fr. Bock. Mit einem Vorworte von Dr. George Müller, Bischof von Munster. Band I., Lieferung 1. Bonn. (History of the Liturgical Vestments of the Middle Ages; or, the Origin and Development of Ecclesiastical Ornaments and Apparel, in reference to Materials, Texture, Colour, Pattern, Style, and Ritual Significance. Illustrated by 110 plates printed in colours.) Vol. I., Part 1. London: Nutt. 8vo, pp. xvi, 122. Plates i.—xix.*

Clamageran.—*De l'Etat Actuel du Protestantisme en France*, par J. J. Clamageran. Paris: 12mo, pp. 100.

Claparede.—*Histoire des Eglises Réformées du pays de Gex. Par Theod. Claparede.* Geneva and Paris. 8vo, pp. viii, 352.

De Potter.—*Résumé de l'Histoire du Christianisme depuis Jésus jusqu'à nos jours. 2 Vols.* Brussels. 16mo.

Dindorf.—*Athanasii Alexandrini Precepta ad Antiochum. Ad codices duos recensuit Gulielmus Dindorfus.* Lipsiæ. 12mo, pp. xii, 78.

Farelle.—*Le Spiritualisme Chrétien. Par Felix de la Farelle.* Paris. 8vo, pp. 272.

Haag.—*La France Protestante, ou Vies des Protestants Français qui se sont fait un Nom dans l'Histoire, depuis les premiers temps de la Reformation, jusqu'à la reconnaissance du principe de la liberté des cultes par l'Assemblée Nationale. Par M. Eug. et Em. Haag.* Paris. 8vo. Parts XIII. to XVI.

- Hofmann.**—Symbolik, oder systematische Darstellung des symbolischen Lehrbegriffs der verschiedenen Christlichen Kirchen und namhaften Sekten. Von Prof. Rud. Hofmann. (A systematic Survey of the Doctrinal Systems of the different Christian Churches and the principal Sects.) Leipsic. 8vo, pp. xvi, 550.
- Krabinger.**—S. Ambrosii Episcopi Mediolanensis, de Officiis Ministrorum, libri III. cum Paulini Libello de Vita S. Ambrosii. Ad codicum MSS. editionumque præcipuarum fidem recognovit et adnotatione critica illustravit, Jo. Georgius Krabinger. Tübingen. 8vo, pp. xii, 420.
- Lehman (Dr. H.)**—Studien zur Geschichte des Apostolischen Zeitalters. (Studies on the History of the Apostolic Age.) Griefswald. 4to.
- Meyer (Dr. H. A. W.)**—Kritisch-exegetisches Handbuch über den Brief an die Galater. (Critico-exegetical Handbook on the Epistle to the Galatians.) Göttingen. 8vo.
- Noack (Ludovicus.)**—Joannis Bodini Colloquium Heptaplomeres, de Rerum sublimium Arcanis abditis. E. Cod. Mss. nunc primum typis describendum curavit. Suerini Megaloburgiensi. 8vo, pp. 360.
- Orosii (Pauli.)**—Pauli Orosii Presbyteri Hispani adversus Paganos, Historiarum libri septem. Thorunil. 8vo, pp. 328.
- Reinke.**—Die Messianischen Psalmen. Einleitung, Grundtext und Übersetzung, nebst einem Philologisch-critischen und Historischen Commentar; von Laur. Reinke, Dom-Capitular, Ord. Professor der Theologie und Orientalischen Sprachen an der Königl. Academie zu Münster, etc., Erster Band. Giessen. 8vo, 450 pp. (The Messianic Psalms. Introduction, Original Text, and Translation; with a Philologico-critical and Historical Commentary.)
- Schöpff (F. G. P.)**—Nicolai de Clamengis Liber de Studio Theologico. Dresden. 12mo, pp. 32.
- Semichon.**—La Paix et la Trêve de Dieu. Histoire des premiers développements du Tiers-état, par l'Eglise et les Associations. Par Ernest Semichon. Paris. 8vo, pp. xii, 448.
- Sophocles (E. A.)**—Modern Greek Grammar. Boston. 8vo.
- Uhlemann.**—Handbuch der gesammten Ägyptischen Alterthumskunde. Erster Theil. Geschichte der Ägyptologie. Von Dr. Max Uhlemann. (Handbook of Egyptian Archæology in General. Part 1. History of Egyptology.) Leipsic. 8vo, pp. viii, 252.
- Verhandlungen der auf Allerhöchsten Befehl, vom 2 November bis 5 December, 1856, in Berlin, Abgehaltenen Kirchlichen Conferenz.** (Transactions of the Ecclesiastical Conference, held by Supreme Authority in Berlin, from November 2 to December 5, 1856.) Berlin: 8vo, pp. 600.

ENGLISH.

- A Concordance of the Prayer-book Version of the Psalms.** London: Mozleys. 24mo, pp. 160.
- Armstrong (G. D., D.D.)**—The Doctrine of Baptisms: Scriptural Examination of the questions respecting, I., The translation of the Greek word: II., The mode of Baptism: III., The Subjects of Baptism. New York. 8vo.
- Bellows.**—The Relation of Public Amusements to Public Morality, especially of the Theatre to the Highest Interests of Humanity. An Address delivered at the Academy of Music, New York, before the "American Dramatic Fund Society," for the Benefit of the Fund. By Rev. Henry W. Bellows, D.D., Pastor of All Souls' Church, New York. New York: C. S. Francis and Co.
- Binney.**—Christians at the Grave: Paul at the Cross: and Christ on the Mount. The Funeral Sermons occasioned by the death of the late Dr. Harris, Principal of New College. Edited by the Rev. T. Binney. London: Ward and Co. 12mo, pp. 132.

- Bleek.**—A Concise Grammar of the Persian Language, containing Dialogues, Reading Lessons, and a Vocabulary; together with a New Plan for Facilitating the Study of Languages, and Specimens in Arabic, Armenian, Bengali, Greek, Georgian, Hindostani, Hebrew, Latin, Persian, Russian, Sanskrit, Swedish, Syriac, and Turkish. By A. H. Bleek, formerly of the British Museum, and afterwards of the late Land Transport Corps. London: Bernard Quaritch. 18mo, pp. 288.
- Brown (Rev. J., D.D.)**—An Analytical Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans. Edinburgh: Oliphant. 8vo.
- Bromehead.**—A Popular Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. With Notes. By the Rev. A. Crawford Bromehead, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy. 12mo pp. 228.
- Bomberger.**—The Protestant Theological and Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia; being a condensed Translation of Herzog's Real Encyclopædia, with additions from other sources. By the Rev. J. H. A. Bomberger, D.D., assisted by distinguished Theologians of various denominations. Part IV., from p. 385 to p. 512. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.
- Carter.**—A Memoir of John Armstrong, D.D., late Lord Bishop of Grahamstown. By the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer; with an Introduction by Samuel, Lord Bishop of Oxford. Oxford: Parkers. 18mo, pp. 436.
- Dobbin.**—The Divine Intention of the Gospels Vindicated: an Act Sermon preached in the chapel of Trinity College, Dublin, for the Degree of B.D., on Sunday, June 28, 1857. By Orlando T. Dobbin, LL.D., and B.D., T.C.D., Incumbent of Killoconnigan, diocese of Meath. London: Bagster and Sons. 8vo.
- Foote.**—Closing Scenes in the Life of Christ; being a Sequel to "Incidents in the Life of our Saviour." By the Rev. A. L. R. Foote, Brechin. London: Nisbet. 12mo, pp. 320.
- Gaber.**—The Lord's Prayer, with Illustrations after Ludwig Richter, engraved on wood by A. Gaber. Dresden: Gaber and Richter. London: Dulau and Co. Large 4to. Nine plates in a portfolio.
- Geare.**—Essays on the Progressive Development of the Divine Purpose in Creation, Providence, Redemption. By the Rev. Edward Geare, A.M., Chaplain of the Gaol, Abingdon, and Lecturer, etc. London: Judd and Glass. 8vo, pp. 416.
- Graves.**—The History, Architecture, and Antiquities of the Cathedral Church of St. Canice, Kilkenny. By the Rev. James Graves, A.B., and J. G. A. Prim. Dublin: Hodges and Smith. 4to, pp. 370.
- Groves.**—Echoes from Egypt; or, the Type of Antichrist. By the Rev. W. J. Groves, M.A.; sometime Vicar of Chewton Mendip, in the county of Somerset. London: Rivingtons. 8vo, pp. 484.
- Haydn's Oratorio, The Seasons** (composed in the year 1800), in Vocal Score, with a Separate Accompaniment for the Organ or Pianoforte. Arranged by Vincent Novello. London: Novello. Large 8vo, pp. 186.
- Hervey (Rev. Lord Arthur.)**—A Letter to the Rev. Dr. Wordsworth on the Declaration of the Clergy on Marriage and Divorce. London: Murray. 8vo, pp. 32.
- Hobart.**—The State of the Departed: an Address delivered at the Funeral of the Rt. Rev. Benjamin Moore, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York, and Rector of Trinity Church, in the City of New York, on Friday, March 1, 1816, in Trinity Church, New York. And a Dissertation on the same Subject. By John Henry Hobart, D.D., Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the State of New York. New York: Thomas N. Stanford.
- Keble.**—An Argument against immediately Repealing the Laws which treat the Nuptial Bond as Indissoluble. By the Rev. John Keble, M.A. Oxford and London: Parkers. 8vo, pp. 228.
- Kendrick (A. A., D.D.)**—Revised Edition of Olshausen's Commentary on the New Testament. The Translation reprinted from Clark's Foreign Theological Library. Vols. I., II., III. New York.
- Lyttelton (Lord.)**—Tracts on Infant Baptism and the Athanasian Creed. London: Rivingtons. 8vo, pp. 39.
- Mailler.**—The Philosophy of the Bible; or, the Union between Philosophy and Faith. By the Rev. J. W. Mailler, M.A. Edinburgh: Hogg. 12mo, pp. 310.

- Milne.**—*Life in China.* By the Rev. W. C. Milne, M.A., for many years Missionary among the Chinese. With four original Maps. London: Routledge. 12mo. pp. 530.
- M'Lachlan.**—*Christ our Study; or, a Practical Treatise on Christ in his official character.* By the Rev. Peter M'Lachlan, Probationer of the Free Church, Glasgow. London: Judd and Glass. 12mo, pp. 260.
- Monod.**—*Adolphe Monod's Farewell to his Friends and the Church.* Translated from the French. London: Nisbet. 12mo, pp. 210.
- Murphy.**—*Science and Religion before the Flood.* By J. G. Murphy, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Presbyterian College, Belfast. Belfast: Shepherd and Co. 18mo, pp. 82.
- Owen (J. J., D.D.)**—*A Commentary, critical, expository, and practical, on the Gospels of Matthew and Mark.* New York. 12mo.
- Pusey.**—*The Councils of the Church, from the Council of Jerusalem, A.D. 51, to the Council of Constantinople, A.D. 381; chiefly as to their constitution, but also as to their objects and history.* By the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., Regius Professor of Hebrew, and Canon of Christ Church. Oxford: J. H. Parker. 8vo, pp. 870.
- Raikes.**—*Sermons and Essays.* By the Rev. Henry Raikes, late Chancellor of the Diocese of Chester. London: Hatchard. 8vo, pp. 518.
- Smith (Professor H. B.)**—*Revised Edition of Gieseler's Text-book of Church History, as translated in Clark's Foreign Theological Library.* New York. 8vo.
- Sumner.**—*The Earth: Past, Present, and Future: a Lecture.* By the Rev G. H. Sumner, M.A., Rector of Old Alresford, Hants, and Chaplain to the Archbishop of Canterbury. London: Routledge. 18mo, pp. 46.
- Turner.**—*The Epistle to the Ephesians, in Greek and English; with an Analysis and Exegetical Commentary.* By Samuel H. Turner, D.D. New York: Dana and Company. 8vo, pp. xx, 198.
- Whately.**—*The Scripture Doctrine concerning the Sacraments and the Points connected therewith.* By Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. London: Parker and Son. 12mo, pp. 186.
- Whately.**—*Instruction in the Scriptures; the Duty and the Mode of it.* A Charge delivered by Richard Whately, D.D., Archbishop of Dublin. London: John W. Parker and Son. Dublin: Hodges and Smith. 8vo, pp. 88.
- Wordsworth.**—*On Divorce.* By Chr. Wordsworth, D.D., Canon of Westminster. London: Rivingtons. 8vo.
-

THE
JOURNAL
OF
SACRED LITERATURE
AND
BIBLICAL RECORD.

~~~~~  
No. XII.—JANUARY, 1858.  
~~~~~

GOD'S PROVIDENTIAL AND MORAL GOVERNMENT.

THE doctrine which we hold to be the correct one, supported both by the evidence of Scripture and of reason, is, that all created things are sustained in existence, and directed and controlled in all their movements, by the *immediate* agency of God. It is a doctrine which may be regarded as resulting directly from the attributes which distinguish the Creator. If God is infinitely wise, and powerful, and good, then we are irresistibly led to the conclusion, that he will take care of his creatures; that he will preserve and govern the world. The manifestations of power, wisdom, and goodness, seen in the wonderful and glorious system of the universe, lead us to expect that he is both able and willing to control it. His power is infinite, and is equal to the task of upholding and governing the universe which he has created. The *reality* of God's providence may therefore be regarded as resulting from his attributes.

Experience also furnishes us with abundant evidences of God's sustaining and controlling agency, both in the natural and the moral world. The order and harmony of creation, the adaptation of means to ends, and the operations that are constantly going on around us, teach us to recognize the hand of a wise and powerful Governor, controlling and guiding all things to the accomplishment of benevolent ends: "Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge" regarding him. "The manner in which we are continued in life, the delicate

structure of our frame, the dangers to which we find ourselves constantly exposed, the deep consciousness we have of our own weakness, and our utter insufficiency for our own safety and happiness, must indelibly impress the sentiment on us, that in God we live and move, and have our being." The physical enquirer into the constitution and laws of the universe finds there those evidences which tell him of God, as a wise and skilful Architect; but a survey of the works of Providence teach us, in the words of Leibnitz, that "God has the qualities of a good Governor as well as of a great Architect."

In the history of human affairs, whether as relating to communities or to individuals, we trace the workings of God's hands. "As the consideration of nature," says Niebuhr, "shews an inherent intelligence, which may also be conceived as coherent with nature, so does history on a hundred occasions shew an intelligence which is distinct from nature, which conducts and determines those things which may seem to us accidental, and it is not true that the study of history weakens the belief in a Divine Providence. History is of all kinds of knowledge the one which tends most decidedly to that belief." Is not the presiding care of God manifested in the events of the lives of the patriarchs, as they are recorded in Scripture? In every step of their wanderings, and in every incident of their eventful lives, do we not behold evidences of an all-directing and gracious Providence? Every one who has been duly observant of events as they transpired around him, both in regard to his fellow-men and to himself, must be convinced of the presence and government of God among his creatures. Does he not often guide us by a way we know not? Blessings come unsought, and evils befall us which we looked not for, and our plans are sometimes baffled, however wisely we may have arranged them. There is everywhere a hand unseen guiding all things; "and none can stay his hand, or say what doest thou?" We *feel* that there is a power and a wisdom above us.

In the history of nations there is everywhere apparent the hand of God guiding their destinies. The rise and fall of empires is, equally with the wanderings of the solitary pilgrim, under his control, and guided by his unerring wisdom. Human agency is doubtless the principal means by which the ends are accomplished; but the human agent is directed by a wisdom not his own; he is raised up and qualified for his special work, and when he has done his service, he then passes away and gives place to others. The history of the empires of old, of Babylon, Persia, Greece, and Rome, illustrates in a remarkable manner the government of God over the destinies of nations. Every page of

history, indeed, records the doings of Jehovah's hands, and proclaims that "God judgeth among the nations, and reigns in righteousness and in mercy over all the earth."

The atheistic theory, which would banish God from the government of the world he has created, represents "natural laws" as constituting the only power that exists in the world. It speaks of the universe as a vast machine wound up by its Creator, and set in motion, and then left without his care or control to run its destined course. Cowper has given a clear and comprehensive view of this theory in the following lines:—

"Some say that in the origin of things,
When all creation started into birth,
The infant elements received a law,
From which they swerve not since,—that under force
Of that controlling ordinance they move,
And need not His immediate hand who first
Prescribed their course to regulate it now;
Thus dream they and contrive to save a God
Th' encumbrance of his own concerns, and spare
The great Artificer of all that moves,
The stress of a continual act, the pain
Of unremitted vigilance and care,
As too laborious and severe a task.
So man, the moth, is not afraid it seems
To spare omnipotence, and measure might
That knows no measure, by the scanty rule
And standard of his own."

The advocates of this doctrine hold that God, at the creation, imparted certain powers to both the material and spiritual world, and established certain laws, according to which these powers operate, and arranged the mechanism of the universe so perfectly, that having once set it in motion, it goes on without any need of his continued agency; that the powers and principles with which he has endowed all things continue in unimpaired efficiency, and produce their proper effects, without any farther interference. They deny that the Creator exercises any active agency in governing the affairs of the universe.

We believe, in common with the supporters of this theory, that God prescribed certain laws to the universe which he created; but while they assert that all events take place, and are regulated entirely, by the operation of these laws, without any present agency of God, we believe, on the contrary, that all events occur, and all results are produced, by the present operation of the divine power, as their ultimate cause. This atheistic theory, indeed, admits the idea of God as the Creator of all things, but

it rejects the idea of God as the Preserver and Governor of the world. It excludes God from any present interference with the universe which he has created. But, as Dugald Stewart has remarked, those philosophers are justly chargeable with gross inconsistency, "who imagine that by likening the universe to a machine, they get rid of the necessity of admitting the constant agency of powers, essentially different from the known qualities of matter. . . . Whether, with Malebranche, we resolve every effect into the immediate agency of God, or suppose that he employs the instrumentality of second causes, we are equally forced to admit, with Bacon, the necessity not only of a first contriver and mover, but of his constant and efficient concurrence (either immediately or mediately) in carrying his design into execution. 'Opus,' says Bacon, 'quod operatur Deus a primordio usque ad finem.' "

It is true the agency of God in preserving and governing the world is invisible, but its invisibility is no proof that it does not exist. The advocates of this scheme ascribe the phenomena of nature to a cause which is no more visible than the divine cause. The inherent powers and energies of nature to which they would ascribe all effects are as invisible as is the energy of God. The supposition that the cause of the phenomena of nature lies in nature itself, and not in God, is entirely gratuitous, having no arguments whatever to support it. Were the defenders of this system to declare their real sentiments in regard to it, they would doubtless say that they delighted in the scheme, not because it was sanctioned by a sound philosophy, or vindicated by conclusive reasoning, but because it delivered them from all those terrors awakened in the unsanctified heart by the thought of living under the active and constant government of a God of justice. It delivers them from all those agitations and dark forebodings which arise from the contemplation of the government of a God of spotless holiness, and of unbending justice, and this makes the system so welcome to their feelings.

The most plausible and common illustration of this scheme (and the illustration, also, is used as an argument in its defence) is derived from the mechanism of a clock. As he is reckoned a more skilful mechanic who constructs a clock which will go correctly for a great length of time, without any farther attention from him, than the one who, after having completed his work, needs continually to stand by it, and to move and regulate it with his hand; so it is argued, God is more honoured in so forming the world that it will go of itself, and accomplish all its ends without any farther attention and care from him, than if it still needed his constant agency and controlling power to sustain

and govern it. Dr. Samuel Clarke, in his correspondence with Leibnitz, thus satisfactorily disposes of this argument :—

“ The reason why, among men, an artificer is justly esteemed so much the more skilful as the machine of his composing will continue longer to move regularly, without any farther interposition of the workman, is, because the skill of all human artificers consists only in composing, adjusting, or putting together certain movements, the principles of whose motion are altogether independent of the artificer; such as are weights and springs, and the like, whose forces are not made but only adjusted by the workman. But, with regard to God, the case is quite different; because he not only composes, or puts things together, but is himself the author and continual preserver of their original forces, or moving powers; and, consequently, it is not a diminution, but the glory of his workmanship, that nothing is done without his continual government and inspection. The notion of the world's being a great machine, going on without the interposition of God, as a clock continues to go without the assistance of the clockmaker, is the notion of materialism and fate, and under pretence of making God a supra-mundane intelligence, tends to exclude providence and God's government, in reality, out of the world. And by the same reason that a philosopher can represent all things going on from the beginning of the creation without any government or interposition of providence, a sceptic will easily argue still farther backwards, and suppose that things have from eternity gone on as they now do, without any true creation or original author at all, but only what such arguers call, *all-wise and eternal nature*. If a king had a kingdom wherein all things would continually go on without his government or interposition, or without his attending to and ordering what is done therein, it would be to him merely a nominal kingdom; nor would he, in reality, deserve at all the title of king or governor. And as those men who pretend that in an earthly government things may go on perfectly well without the king himself ordering or disposing of anything, may reasonably be suspected that they would like very well to set the king aside; so, whosoever contends that the course of the world can go on without the continual direction of God, the supreme Governor, his doctrine does, in effect, tend to exclude God out of the world.”

We do not object to the scheme referred to, because it includes in it a reference to the laws and properties of nature. We hold that there are such laws and properties, as well as do our opponents. But we object to the system, because it separates these general laws and powers of nature from the constant agency of God,—because it makes these laws independent of God. Both matter and mind are endowed with various properties and powers, which operate according to certain fixed and definite laws. We recognize these powers in all we say or think regarding the material and spiritual worlds; but while all this is true, it is yet not the whole truth. There is a power above the powers of nature; and we hold that these powers and laws

of nature are dependent on the power and agency of God. Such dependence is involved in the very idea of God. Nothing can any more continue to exist than it can begin to exist without the efficacious will of God. The powers and laws of nature are thus dependent on God, because they were created by him. They exist, because God wills their existence. God worketh all in all. The power and agency of the creature is an effect flowing from the power and agency of God. The agency and power of all created things is related to the divine agency in the same way as an effect is related to its cause. Further, to use the language of Dr. Carpenter, the most distinguished physiologist of the present day,—

“ I can conceive of no agency intermediate between an Infinite Deity and his works. Either all the phenomena of the material universe are the immediate results of his will, or they have no dependence on it whatsoever. In the former case the *laws of nature* are simply expressions of what ~~we~~ know, or imagine, as to the mode of operation of that will. In the latter they are nothing else than concise statements of comprehensive truths, established by observation. In neither case can the ‘laws’ be conceived to have any real force or agency in themselves; such as is attributed to them by those who speak of the Deity as framing laws for the universe, and then leaving them to their own independent operation. This mode of viewing the subject has probably originated from the supposed analogy of human legislature; but the analogy, when carefully examined, not only fails to support such a doctrine, but sustains that for which I have argued. For a human ‘law’ is nothing else than an expression of the will of the governing power; and its action upon the community entirely depends upon the constant, though silent operation, of that will. Let the governing power be overthrown by political convulsion, and the laws no longer exert any controlling agency.”

This controlling energy of the Supreme Governor extends to the phenomena of the spiritual as well as of the natural world. In Scripture the duties of the Christian life are represented as performed by the agency of man; and the same duties are also represented in other texts as entered upon and performed only through the divine agency directing and sustaining man.

“ Now in what way,” says a distinguished theologian, “are we to determine the meaning of these two classes of texts? Are we to consider them as contradictory? Are we at liberty to adopt the one class as true, and to reject the other as false, or so to explain them away as to leave them no determinate signification? If men incline their own hearts to obedience, must we conclude that God does not incline them? If they are required to make themselves a new heart, does it follow that God does not give them a new heart? If they turn from sin to righteousness, is it certain that God does not cause them to turn,—and is it certain that their obedience is independent of his agency? Are we not bound, on the con-

trary, to put such a construction upon the two classes of texts that both may be admitted as true? And how is this to be done? Evidently by considering the agency of men as the consequence of the agency of God. If he causes them to walk in his commands, they do actually thus walk. If he makes them obedient, they really obey. If he turns their hearts, they themselves turn. If he gives them a new heart and a new spirit, they exercise the affections of a new heart. Not that the agency of God is identified with the agency of men; but the one is the consequence of the other, as dependent on the other."

But while God has established a regular order in the sequences of events, both in the natural and in the spiritual world, he has also established the principle of a particular adaptation in reference to man, and this constitutes the peculiarity of divine providence. The two principles may seem to us to be irreconcilable,—the principle of general law, and of special adaptation to the circumstances of man, yet they are actually reconciled in the government of God. In the government of the supreme ruler the two principles act in harmonious co-operation, and their co-operation and harmony constitutes one of the most wonderful peculiarities of the divine administration,—it constitutes what has commonly been called the providence of God.

The system of general laws according to which God governs the universe, is most beneficial in its tendency. Many advantages and blessings result from it to man. Indeed, uniformity in the sequences of events is absolutely necessary, not only to our welfare, but to our very existence. "Without the certainty" arising from general law, "men would waver as in a dream, and wander as in a trackless desert."

"How is it possible," says Dr. Godwin, "that any course of action could have been commenced, that any provision could have been made, that any precaution could have been taken, if it had been a matter of uncertainty what effects would follow from any given causes? If fire had sometimes produced heat and sometimes cold; if a stone, let fall from the hand, had sometimes descended, and at others had moved in a horizontal direction, or glanced upwards; if at different times the same external objects produced opposite sensations; if the impressions on the organs of sense were followed by very different perceptions; if, in a word, there had not been fixed and constant laws for the succession of the various phenomena, we could have calculated on nothing, all would have been uncertainty and confusion; in conducting the affairs of life reason would have been worthless and instinct useless; the existence of either would have been scarcely possible, and the whole frame of nature, instead of exhibiting beautiful harmony, would have been only a wild and disordered chaos. To say the least, we can have no conception how such a state of things could have been compatible with the welfare of sentient and rational beings. That the divine energy works throughout

nature with this uniformity, appears to be the result of wisdom and goodness, adapting the whole to the condition of the creatures which he has made."

But there is something more than universal general law prevailing in the affairs of this world. We are surrounded by events which to us seem accidental and altogether fortuitous, which are yet the appointments of God as the instruments of his government. We observe in the physical world events which are not the result of any single general law, but of several laws combining,—of the intermingling and mutual influence of various agencies. For had there been nothing but general laws, then the occurrence of every event could certainly have been anticipated, just as we can calculate the motions of the planets, the periodical occurrence of eclipses of the sun and moon, the return of the tides of the ocean, and many other phenomena in nature. But in very many instances the events which occur around us cannot possibly be reckoned upon; no human sagacity can foresee them. One result is modified by another, and they are so endlessly intermingled that the shrewdest foresight cannot anticipate them.

The uncertainty which meets us everywhere

"appears more especially in those departments of God's works with which man is most intimately connected. As we come closer to man the elements of uncertainty become more numerous. How uncertain are all the events on which man's bodily and external welfare depends. He is dependent on the weather, and it is so variable that its changes cannot be anticipated. And yet it is scarcely more capricious than the whole course of events, prosperous or adverse, arising from his fellow-men or from nature, on which his whole earthly destiny depends. But nowhere is this complication, with its consequent uncertainty, so strikingly displayed as in the constitution of his bodily frame. The most wonderful and ingenious of the physical works of God on the earth, it is also the most complex. Every one part is so dependent on every other, that the least derangement (and they are all liable to derangement) in any one of its organs may terminate in excruciating anguish, in wasting disease, or immediate death. A cut is inflicted on the thumb, and ends in lock-jaw. A sudden change takes place in the atmosphere, of which the individual breathes, and quickens into life a malady which wastes the lungs and the frame till it ends in dissolution. A particular vital vessel bursts, and instant death follows. A derangement takes place in the nerves or brain, and henceforth the mind itself reels and staggers. It appears that the uncertainty increases the nearer we come to man, and there is nothing so uncertain as bodily health and human destiny."^a

This uncertainty in regard to the events that befall mankind

^a Mc Cosh's *Method of Divine Government*, p. 166.

is specially intended by an all-wise Ruler for the accomplishment of specific purposes in the administration of the affairs of his government. It makes God's providence particular in its character, and is designed to teach man his entire dependence upon God. "Those unforeseen accidents," says Isaac Taylor, "which so often control the lot of men, constitute a superstratum in the system of human affairs, wherein peculiarly the divine providence holds empire for the accomplishment of its special purposes. It is from this hidden and inexhaustible mine of chances, as we must call them, that the Governor of the world draws with unfathomable skill the materials of his dispensations towards each individual of mankind."

The chain of events may seem to us long and complicated, but every link of it is wisely adjusted by the overruling hand of God. The sequences of nature are skilfully disposed, so as to secure the special ends contemplated. By a concurrence of natural laws and agencies which he controls, God accomplishes all the purposes of his wisdom. The causes which bring about these ends may be numerous, and may silently operate for ages, but in all their complexity and in every stage of their progress they are directed and controlled by infinite wisdom and power. Thus he guides and governs the destinies of individuals and communities and nations.

This aspect of divine providence makes man feel his ignorance and entire dependence on God. He knows not what an hour shall bring forth, and is every moment conscious that his times are wholly in the divine hand. Man's knowledge in the various departments of nature may be extensive and accurate, but it utterly fails in regard to the government and the providence of God. Nay, the more extensive his knowledge is, he learns to bow with the deeper reverence before the throne of the Supreme Ruler, acknowledging his ignorance and his helplessness. The contingencies of providence subdue all pride and self-complacency in man, and constrain him to feel his need of the divine aid, and to cherish a grateful confidence in the wisdom and goodness of him who ruleth over all. Infinite wisdom and exhaustless benevolence characterize all his actions, and in regard to the events which befall man in this world we cherish the confidence that he doeth all things well.

The providential government of God is *particular* and *universal*, extending to all his creatures and all their actions. In this view of it the doctrine is one of deep interest and importance. It teaches us that God is ever near to us, that he is everywhere around us, and is at all times present with us.

There are some who, while they admit that God exercises a

providential government over the world, deny that that government is particular and universal, extending to all things and to all events. They declare it to be only *general*, exercised over the world as a whole.

But a general providence, which is thus admitted, comprehends and necessarily implies in it a particular providence. The world, as a whole, is made up of parts, and it is absurd to speak of a government over the whole, and yet not extending to the parts. We cannot conceive it possible that God should sustain and govern the whole world, and yet not sustain and govern the several parts which constitute the whole. If God did not concern himself with the smaller parts, how could he concern himself with the whole, which is but the aggregate of these parts? If God takes care of all his creatures, he must take care of every individual creature. To admit a general providence and yet to deny a particular and universal providence, is, therefore, absurd, for to govern the whole, God must govern the constituent parts.

It is admitted that this general providence respects the weighty affairs of kingdoms and of nations. But if God governs the more important and weighty interests of nations, his providence must respect every event that occurs. If he exercises dominion over a nation, he must exercise dominion over each individual in the nation. To govern the whole he must govern the several parts; he must direct and control every individual, and in all his affairs. A general providence, therefore, necessarily involves in it a particular providence, in its most comprehensive sense. If we prove that God exercises a general government over the whole world, we at the same time prove that that government is universal and particular.

The Scriptures frequently affirm the speciality of divine providence. It is not needful that we should quote from them extensively in proof of this. We are there taught that God is everywhere present; that in him we live, and move, and have our being; that he worketh all things after the counsel of his own will. "Man's heart deviseth his way, but the Lord directeth his steps. The lot is cast into the lap, but the whole disposing thereof is of God." God fixes the bounds of our habitation. He feeds the ravens and the young lions; he takes care of the sparrows, clothes the lilies of the field, and numbers the hairs of our head. The Scriptures uniformly teach that God governs and directs the affairs not only of nations and of kingdoms, but also of individuals in the minutest concerns of life.

"The whole compass of human thoughts—designs, pursuits, characters, interests, enjoyments, and sufferings, are represented as being under the eye of God, and as controlled by his wisdom and power. There is no

exception to this. According to the Bible there is no limitation of the providence of God. It reaches all things great and small, both in the natural and in the spiritual world. There is no conceivable way in which the sacred writers could have more strongly asserted or more clearly illustrated the particular and universal providence of God than they have done. And if the doctrine is not true, prophets and apostles, and Christ himself, were greatly mistaken.”^b

It is objected that it is derogatory to God's dignity to concern himself with all the little things which exist, and with all the little and insignificant affairs both of his rational and irrational creatures. John Howe thus quaintly describes the principles of those who advance such an objection against the doctrine of the speciality of Providence:—

“Great care is taken by them to set the Deity at a distance remote enough. He must be complimented out of this world as a place too mean for his reception, and unworthy such a presence, and with the same pretence of observance and respect it is judged too great a trouble to him, and inconsistent with the felicity of his nature and being, that he should give himself any diversion or disturbance in governing the world; so that nothing more of duty is owing to him than a certain kind of arbitrary veneration which we give to any thing or person that we apprehend to excel us, and to be in some respects better than ourselves—an observance merely upon courtesy. We are not obliged to worship him as one with whom we have any concern, and do owe him no more homage than the great Mogul or the Khan of Tartary, and, indeed, are less liable to his severity, or capable of his favours, than theirs; for of theirs we are in some remote possibility capable, but of his, not at all. In one word, all converse between him and man—on his part by providence, and on our's by religion—is quite cut off.”

All the force of this objection arises from supposing an analogy which does not exist between the agency of God and the agency of man. We are to dismiss from our minds all ideas of such an analogy when we think of the government of the Supreme. Because it would be burdensome to man, and incompatible with his attention to higher and more important objects, to attend continually to little and apparently trifling matters, we are not by any means to suppose that this would be the case with God. “God's ways are not as our ways, nor his thoughts as our thoughts.” It is our imperfection that we cannot give our attention to more than one object at one and the same instant of time; but surely it would elevate our every idea of the perfections of God did we know that while his comprehensive mind could grasp the whole amplitude of nature to the very outermost of its boundaries he had an attentive eye fastened on the very humblest of its objects, and pondered every thought of

^b Dr. Leonard Wood's Works, vol. ii., p. 10.

my heart, and noticed every footstep of my goings, and treasured up in his remembrance every turn and every movement of my history. And that this glorious conception of the Divine Being must be the true one is evident; for, as John Foster has remarked, "To say that we can in the abstract conceive of a magnitude of intelligence and power which would constitute the Deity, *if he possessed it*, a more glorious and adorable being than he actually is, could be nothing less than flagrant impiety."^c

It results from our feebleness and imperfection that we are unable to attend to many things at once, and are under the necessity of choosing those which are most important and worthy of our attention. We cannot, and ought not to, occupy our time with little things when great and weighty interests demand our care, and are in danger of being neglected by attention to these little matters. It must be observed also, in replying to this objection, that when little and apparently trifling things affect great matters, then they are no longer insignificant, but assume a greatness in proportion to their issues, and then we do not feel it to be either degrading or unworthy of us to give to them our earnest attention. When small matters affect weighty interests, then they are important, and demand our care. Now apply this view of the case to all the events that occur in our world, the seemingly most trifling and insignificant. How do we know but that they are all of the highest importance because of their influence upon, and their connexion with, other things? We know that no isolated event occurs on earth. All are parts of a vast machinery, and nothing can be wanting or neglected without detriment to the whole. In the economy of the world the smallest insect is necessary to fill an important function in the great chain of existence. The ephemeron is even necessary, and its extinction would injure and, it may be, eventually destroy the whole animated creation. And God cannot be burdened or perplexed with the multiplicity of objects which claim his regard. All things are ever present to his mind. He sees all things, and in the vast range of his omniscience knows all things that exist. His attention to the highest rank of created intelligences does not distract his attention from the meanest insect he has created. He has created all, and all are alike cared for by him, and sustained by his bounty. This universal and all-comprehensive providence is not wearisome to Jehovah. There is nothing like effort or exertion put forth. Infinite in power as in wisdom and knowledge, his governing and upholding all things requires no labour. With infinite ease he puts forth his

^c Chalmers' *Astronom. Disc.*, and John Foster's *Review of Chalmers*.

omnipotence to sustain an insect or create a universe. His agency is as perfect in the smallest as in the greatest of all created things.

But this objection will lie against the work of creation, as well as against the work of providence. It is alleged that little things are unworthy of God's care. But were not all things, even the meanest and most insignificant, created by God? And if the creation of these things was not unworthy of God's exalted character—for no one will be so bold as to assert that it was—then it cannot be unworthy of him to extend his care to them. It would be presumptuous in man to say that anything in existence was useless. It would be to impugn the Divine wisdom, and set up the judgment of man in opposition to that of God. In infinite wisdom God created the world. He knew what was necessary to the well-being and the harmony of the system he had chosen, and therefore all things he has created must occupy an important place in the economy of his government. If it is consistent with God's character to call them into existence, then it is in like manner consistent with his character to sustain and govern the creatures he has made.

“It is not for us to bring up our minds to this mysterious agency. Yet that such agency is exerted is undoubted. Yes! the God who created the universe holds it every moment in the hollow of his hand, pencils every flower, and gives nourishment to every blade of grass, and actuates the movements of every living thing. While magnitude does not overpower him, minuteness cannot escape nor variety bewilder him; and though the human mind sinks under the grandeur of the idea, yet true it is—to adopt the language of an eloquent writer—that at the very time while the mind of the Deity is abroad over the whole vastness of creation there is not one particle of matter, there is not one individual principle of rational or of animal existence, there is not one single world in that expanse which teems with them, that his eye does not discern as constantly, and his hand does not guide as unerringly, and his spirit does not watch and care for as vigilantly, as if it formed the one and exclusive object of his attention.”

While God's providential government has a reference to the well-being of all his creatures, his *moral government* relates to the conduct and character of his moral and responsible beings. Man is possessed of a rational and a moral nature. He has the capacity of thinking and reasoning, and can discriminate between right and wrong; he has also the power of choosing the good and rejecting the evil. This power of voluntary choice united with the capacity of judging of the nature and consequences of any course of conduct, renders him a responsible being. Man

is conscious of his responsibility, and is therefore a fit subject of God's moral government.

That there is an essential and eternal distinction between the morally good and the morally evil is a truth which cannot be disputed. The conscience of every man at once and authoritatively proclaims that there is such a distinction. There is a law indelibly written on the hearts of all men. They are a law unto themselves. "This law cannot be abolished or curtailed, nor affected in its sanctions by any law of man. It requires no commentator to render it distinctly intelligible, nor is it different at Rome and Athens now, and in the ages before and after; but in all ages and in all nations it is, and has been, and will be, one and everlasting—one, as that God, its great author and promulgator, who is the common sovereign of all mankind, is himself one." Cicero has thus eloquently described the nature and authority of this law:—

"Est quidem, vera lex, recta ratio, naturæ congruens diffusa in omnes, constans, sempiterna, quæ vocet ad officium, jubendo, vetando a fraude deterreat; quæ tamen neque probos frustra jubet aut vitat, nec improbos jubendo aut vetando movet. Huic legi, nec abrogari fas est, neque derogari ex hac aliquid licet, neque tota abrogari potest. Nec viro, aut per senatum, aut per populum, solvi hac lege possumus. Neque est quærendus explanator aut interpret ejus alius. Nec erit alia lex Romæ, alia Athenis, alia nunc, alia posthac; sed et omnes gentes et omni tempore una lex et sempiterna, et immortales continebit; unusque erit communis quasi magister et Imperator omnium Deus ille legis hujus inventor, disceptator, lator; cui qui non parebit, ipse se fugiet ac naturam hominis aspernabitur, atque hoc ipso luet maximas poenas, etiam si cetera supplicia quæ putantur effugerit."

Again he says,

"Erat enim ratio, profecta a rerum natura, et ad recté faciendum impellens, et a delicto avocans quæ non tum denique incipit lex esse, cum scripta est, sed tum cum orta est; orta autem simul est, cum mente divina."^d

That there is a relation established between the physical and the moral government of God, is a truth equally certain. All the parts or provinces of God's empire are in harmonious connexion, and all are governed to bring about common ends. The physical world is adapted to man, and all its arrangements are fitted to promote his comfort and welfare. But it is subordinate to the moral world, as the promotion of virtue is of more importance than the advancement of physical good. A very cursory survey of God's government will serve to convince us that he has so arranged the events of his providence as to encourage virtue and restrain vice. It is apparent to all that the cultivation of virtuous affections, and a course of virtuous actions, is conducive

^d *De Legibus*, lib. ii.

to health, while the indulgence of evil passions and the practice of vicious conduct are injurious to mental happiness no less than to the welfare of the body. We are so constituted that a course of moral obedience is always attended with inward satisfaction, while vice as invariably brings inward disquietude. The feeling of inward approbation attendant on well-doing makes the virtuous man cheerful and happy. He has no load on his spirits, and no fretting anxiety to disturb his mind; he is not haunted by remorse or depressed and agitated by gloomy forebodings, as is the vicious man. What a blessing is a conscience void of offence toward God and man! It diffuses a calm and joyful serenity over the soul. On the other hand, how wretched is the man whose conscience is ever accusing him! He is ill at ease; his course of vice has planted thorns in his pillow, and he reaps the reward of his own doings. In the complicated arrangements of social life we know how certainly virtue and moral excellence secure advantages to us and promote our temporal well-being. The man of uprightness of character is trusted and esteemed—the man of honesty and integrity commands the respect and friendship of all; while, on the other hand, the dishonest, or cunning, or selfish man, is universally shunned or mistrusted—the vicious man is the object of contempt and detestation.

In the history of the world, how often has God, by the appointments of his providence, laid an arrest upon the course of the transgressor of his law, shortened the arm of the tyrant, and interposed to frustrate the designs of wickedness; and how often also have the good been helped in their self-denying toils, helped by a hand unseen, and when least expecting it have triumphed. For example, the hand of an overruling providence was apparent in the great Reformation. The events which led to it, and the success which attended the efforts of the Reformers, proclaimed the presence of God ruling among the inhabitants of earth. An attentive student of history will be able to point to many events which signally illustrate the same important truth.

The divine government has been so ordered as to convince us that "godliness is profitable unto all things, having promise of the life that now is and of that which is to come," and that "the way of transgressors is hard." Health of body, peace of mind, the esteem of our fellow-men, and a competence of the good things of this life, are the blessings which the righteous ruler bestows as the rewards of well-doing. While on the other hand, a diseased body, disquietude of mind, poverty, and the contempt of others, commonly follow in the steps of the disobedient. The natural course of things in this world obviously favours the virtuous and opposes the vicious. The certain road to misery is the path of disobedience.

The constitution of the human mind, by which we are led, and led irresistibly, to approve of the true and the right, whether we do it or not, testifies to the rectitude of him who created and who governs all things. The connexion of rewards and punishments with obedience or disobedience, proves that he is a God who loveth right and hateth iniquity—that he is a just God. Conscience cries aloud of vengeance to the worker of iniquity. It dashes the cup of forbidden pleasure from his lips, and inflicts on him the wretchedness of remorse. It links together by a bond stronger than death, vice and misery. It has no respect of persons, but deals out even-handed justice to all. It will track the wrong doer to his hiding-place, seize him in the deepest retirement, overtake him in his swiftest flight, pursue him wherever he goes, and as a terrible avenger, with scorpion lash, will visit him with the award of his evil deeds. But while the constitution of the human mind thus testifies to the justice of God, it no less proclaims his benevolence. His connecting misery with evil-doing and happiness with well-doing, is one of the highest evidences of his goodness. We can conceive of the mind being otherwise constituted. Every instance of well-doing might have been accompanied with pain and self-reproach; while, on the contrary, evil actions might have been attended with satisfaction and inward approval. A malevolent being would so have constituted our natures, and thus have removed the strongest incentives to moral obedience and well-doing. But that our moral nature approves what the law of God requires—that the ways of virtue and obedience are ever found to be the ways of pleasantness and of peace, is one of the clearest and most convincing evidences that can be furnished that benevolence constitutes the leading feature of the divine character.

Justice does not dictate the connexion of present reward and happiness with obedience; it only requires that the laws God imposes on his moral creatures should be such as they are able to obey, and that obedience to them should be subservient to his well-being. The union of happiness and satisfaction with obedience must be the dictate of benevolence. The laws God imposes on his subjects are holy, just, and good. Obedience to them is calculated to advance their highest welfare. But in addition to this God has so constituted our minds, that joy and gladness diffuse themselves through the soul in the very act of obeying him. We have an inward satisfaction in the consciousness of having done what we know to be right. There is a pleasure in the very doing of what is right, and also in the consciousness that we have done our duty. The virtuous man has happiness in the very act of well-doing,—in the very act of

virtue, and he has a reflex and an abiding joy in the consciousness of the rectitude of his conduct.

“Virtue is not only seen to be right, it is felt to be delicious. There is happiness in the very wish to make others happy. There is a heart's ease or a heart's enjoyment even in the first purposes of kindness, as well as in its subsequent performances. There is a certain rejoicing sense of clearness in the consistency, the exactitude of justice and truth. There is a triumphant elevation of spirit in magnanimity and honour. In perfect harmony with this, there is a placid feeling of serenity and blissful contentment in gentleness and humility. There is a noble satisfaction in those victories which, at the bidding of principle, or by the power of self-command, may have been achieved over the propensities of animal nature. There is an elate independence of soul in the consciousness of having nothing to hide and nothing to be ashamed of. In a word, by the constitution of our nature each virtue has its appropriate charm; and virtue on the whole is a fund of varied as well as of perpetual enjoyment to him who hath embibed its spirit, and is under the guidance of its principles. He feels all to be health and harmony within; and without, he seems as if to breathe in an atmosphere of beauteous transparency, proving how much the nature of man and the nature of virtue are in unison with each other.”^e

On the other hand, conscience, which God has implanted in our bosoms, rebukes with stern severity every act of disobedience. God has so formed our natures that the very deeds of vice, and the cherishing of the affections attendant on them, fill the soul with disquietude and suffering; evil affections, apart from the condemnation of conscience, inflict of themselves bitterness on the heart. There is pain and misery in moral evil of itself, apart from that pain which is inflicted by a condemning and avenging conscience. There is an essential and inherent bitterness in all vice. There is a misery and wretchedness it invariably inflicts on its unhappy victim. Vice is bitter to the moral taste.

In obeying God's laws we thus adopt the most certain means of securing to ourselves present and lasting happiness and comfort—in keeping his commandments there is great reward. In rendering obedience we only perform a duty—we pay a debt and acquire no merit by it. Obedience gives us no claim to the divine favour. It is but justice in God to demand it, and it is duty in man to yield it. But the adding of positive and present enjoyment to obedience, the rendering of the discharge of duty a source of happiness, justice did not require. This is a gift of pure benevolence, an arrangement of mercy and love. The constitution of our moral nature thus bears upon it the most decisive impress of the goodness of him who constructed its machinery and established its laws.

*

^e Chalmers's *Nat. Theol.*, vol. i., p. 358.

DR. DAVIDSON ON EARLY CORRUPTIONS OF THE TEXT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It is very important that erroneous statements should not go forth to the public uncontradicted; and the more highly the work which contains them is esteemed, the more it is regarded as a reliable authority, the more important is it that they should be pointed out.

Such an erroneous statement, of considerable importance in its bearing on the integrity of the text of the New Testament, and the *allowance* of wilful or negligent corruptions of it among Catholics of the early ages, is made in Dr. Davidson's work on *Biblical Criticism*.^a

The place we refer to is in vol. ii., p. 52, 53; and we quote the whole paragraph that the entire bearing of what we object to may be seen by our readers:—

“It will appear from these observations that allowance should be made for the warmth and enthusiastic zeal of the fathers, in bringing forward accusations of this nature. They were by no means cool, calm, and critical in their procedure; and, therefore, their assertions must be adopted with caution. They cannot be safely relied on, without an examination of the probable foundation on which they proceed. In whatever way the falsifications of the New Testament text on the part of the earliest heretics be viewed, the departures from the true reading that flowed from the source in question into MSS. generally, must have been inconsiderable. *Some* wilful corruptions made by Marcion did certainly get into various copies, but they never obtained an extensive footing. The orthodox Church was awake to the importance of preserving their holy writings from the contamination of heretical hands, and prevented any material falsification. The heretics were comparatively few, and did not possess sufficient influence, even had they been so disposed, to corrupt the records extensively. The Catholic Christians, scattered as they were through many lands, opposed a barrier to radical alterations. The corruptions that took place *within* the Catholic Church were far more serious in their influence than those made out of it; because they were liable to be propagated and perpetuated. As long as one had not been hereticated for his doctrinal views, he might add, take away, and confound readings without exposure to suspicion. This is plain from the fact that Ptolemy, nearly contemporary with Marcion, quoted passages from Matthew, John, and Paul, with some peculiarities resembling those originating with Marcion himself, and yet, so far as is known, without being accused on that account of falsification. Thus he omitted *τοῦ θεοῦ* in 1 Cor. ii. 14, without giving offence. He added to

^a *A Treatise on Biblical Criticism, exhibiting a systematic view of that science.*
By Samuel Davidson, D.D. and LL.D. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 1852.

Matth. v. 39. ὅλως ; to δῶρον, τῷ θεῷ in Matth. xv. 5 ; ὁ πατήρ after εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός in Matth. xix. 17 ; οὐκ οἶδα to καὶ τί εἶπω in John xii. 27. He also altered τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν into τ. π. τῶν πρεσβυτέρων in Matt. xv. 6."

It is plain enough that the force of this passage lies in the assertion, that alterations of the text made by those who were Catholics were connived at : "*As long as one had not been hereticated for his doctrinal views, he might add, take away, and confound readings without exposure to suspicion.*"

This is a very serious charge indeed. It represents the early Christian teachers as indifferent to the wrongness of tampering with the Sacred text, unless when it was done by their opponents.

So serious a charge ought not to have been made without some clear evidence for its truth. The evidence which is alleged, and on which the whole burden of the proof rests, is the instance of Ptolemy. This is the one single testimony. This (viz., that as long as a man had not been hereticated, he might tamper with the text with impunity) is plain *from the fact that Ptolemy*, nearly contemporary with Marcion, quoted passages from Matthew, John, and Paul, with *some peculiarities resembling those originating with Marcion himself*, and yet, so far as is known, without being accused on that account of falsification.

Now it ought to be observed that the charge against Marcion was that of *wilful* falsification, a charge which Dr. Davidson considers was established on the whole, though in particular instances it may have been made without sufficient cause, through his adopting readings found in *codices* current among Catholics themselves, from careless citation, or other like causes.

There would seem here to be three distinct assertions involved. 1. That Ptolemy made, if not serious, at least intentional departures from the (supposed) true text. 2. That Ptolemy was not considered a heretic. 3. That, therefore, his variations of text passed without giving offence or exciting suspicion. We might ask indeed how Dr. Davidson knows that they did give no offence? Are the writings of that age so copious, that we can infer a negative thus easily? Who has noticed Ptolemy or his work at all? Surely he ought to have been sure on this point.

However we have a graver charge to make; we say that each of these assertions is untrue. Ptolemy's variations imply no wilful departure from the text. Dr. Davidson alleges six instances, in these words: "Thus he (1) omitted τὸ θεῶν in 1 Cor. ii. 14, without giving offence. He (2) added to Matt. v. 39, ὅλως ; (3) to δῶρον, τῷ θεῷ in Matt. xv. 5 ; (4) ὁ πατήρ after εἰ μὴ εἰς ὁ θεός in Matt. xix. 17; (5) οὐκ οἶδα after καὶ τί

εἶπω ; in John xii. 27. He also (6) altered τὴν παράδοσιν ὑμῶν into τ.π. τῶν πρεσβυτέρων in Matt. xv. 6."

Now we have no hesitation in saying that in no one of these instances (with one exception) is there the slightest evidence that Ptolemy designedly or *malâ fide* altered the text, or wilfully adopted a variation from any received text. He does not in any instance argue from the variation. He does not allege the words in question (whether inserted or omitted) as of importance. Therefore all that Dr. D. could say is that a careless citation or a various reading was not blamed in a Catholic, and was blamed in a heretic, which softens down his charge of connivance at corruptions of the text very much. But let us see what Ptolemy's offence is. Let us examine the instances *seriatim*.

(1). The first is, "But the carnal man receiveth not the things of the Spirit, for they are foolishness unto him," etc. How many a good Christian might quote the verse in this way, and feel just surprise at any "offence" being taken because he had not said "the things of the Spirit of God;" still more would he feel surprised that it was matter of complaint against the divines of the age in which he lived, that they had taken no offence at his omission, and had not denounced him as a corrupter of the sacred text.

(2). Or again, suppose that in contrasting the Mosaic with the Christian precepts, he had written, "For I say unto you that ye resist not evil *at all*; but if any one," etc., would he not be surprised that his explanatory *at all* was carped at? Why is not the substitution "for" in the place of "but," γὰρ for δέ, equally objected to?

(3). Or if, by way of being better understood, in reciting the passage out of Matt. xv., he had said, "It is a gift *to God*, whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me," is suspicion to be excited because the words "to God" are no part of the sacred text? Is such an explanatory addition a corrupting the text of Scripture?

(4). Or again, suppose one is not pretending to quote Scripture, but using it in a running commentary, thus; "And if the perfect God be good according to his own nature, as indeed he is (for our Saviour himself declared that there is one only good, God, his own Father, whom he manifested"),^a and these are the very words of Ptolemy, is this adding to the text? Or should

^a We give the Greek, being conscious that the words admit of different renderings: καὶ εἰ ὁ τέλειος Θεὸς ἀγαθὸς ἐστὶ κατὰ τὴν ἑαυτῆ φύσιν, ὡσπὲρ καὶ ἔστιν· (ἓνα γὰρ μόνον εἶναι ἀγαθὸν Θεόν, τὸν ἑαυτῆ Πατέρα, ὁ Σωτὴρ ἡμῶν ἀπεφήνατο, ὃν ἐφάνέρωσεν) κ.τ.λ.

we suppose for a moment that the words are anything but Ptolemy's own explanation?

(6). Or, passing by (5), if, in continuing the reciting of Matt. xv., we had said, "And ye have made the law of God of none effect by" (rather "for the sake of") "the tradition of your elders," instead of "your tradition;" does this imply that we had a different reading, or only that we cited *memoriter*, or exegetically, for the sake of clearness.

In case it should be supposed that Ptolemy was, after all, intentionally citing the texts as read by heretics or others, it may be well to add that in (2), (3), (6), Matt. v. 39; xv. 5, 6, there is no evidence extant of any such variation as we find in him. In (4) Matt. xix. 17, some authorities do add *πατήρ*, *e.g.*, Marcosius the heretic, but it is quite evident, on looking at the Greek originals, that Ptolemy was not citing at all, but giving the substance of our Lord's words. In (1) 1 Cor. ii. 14, the Syriac Version is said to omit *τὸ Θεῶς*, and several fathers are cited as omitting it; but from the instances we have examined we conceive that it is not a deliberate omission.

We passed by (5), because we cannot find it in the writings of Ptolemy. We should be glad if Dr. Davidson would look for the passage himself. It would shew him what Ptolemy was, and what was the nature of his views and writings. Had it indeed been so, that the Catholics took no offence at these citations of Ptolemy, should we be surprised, or need we look to their undue partiality for an orthodox friend as a reason for it, or need we accuse them of negligence as to the watchful guardianship of the sacred text?

II. But, after all, Ptolemy was not a Catholic. This writer, whose slips of citation we have been examining, whose slips the Catholics of the second century out of undue partiality connived at, was not a favourite of theirs at all. If ever any man was "hereticated," to use Dr. Davidson's phrase, Ptolemy was. For he is the very Ptolemy, the arch-heretic, against whom especially the great work of St. Irenæus was written.

We read in Dr. Davidson's own translation of Gieseler's *Ecclesiastical History*, i. 1, 2, § 45 (speaking of Valentinus), "The most important of his followers were *Heracleon, Ptolemy, and Marcus*:"^b and the preface of St. Irenæus itself states that it

^b In a note we read, "His *Epistola ad Floram apud Epiphanius (sic)* hæc. xxxiii. A. Stieren de Ptolemæi Gnostici ad Floram epist., p. 1, Jenæ, 1843, distinguishes in the letter two parts proceeding from different authors, both of which, however, could not have been written by Ptolemy." Without going into this question, we will only say that all the letter is heretical, and that Dr. Davidson attributes the citations in question to Ptolemy.

was especially directed against Ptolemy and his school (οἱ περὶ Πτολεμαίου).

But we are not now merely charging Dr. D. with gross ignorance and carelessness as to the circumstance of Ptolemy being a heretic, that is, as to the soundness of the πᾶ στω̄, whereon he rested the lever that was to overthrow the authority of the Primitive Catholic Church, as a faithful and jealous guardian of Holy Writ.

What we have said also shews that Dr. Davidson is most careless in the verification of his authorities, and that even on points which are of the utmost importance to the validity of his arguments. For if he had even *attempted* to examine these citations, he would have found that he must seek for the writings of Ptolemy either in a place of Epiphanius—which he gives and refers to,^c where it would have been found in Hær. xxxiii., *Adversus Ptolemaitas*, as setting forth the heresiarch's views—or among the *Fragments of works of heretics* appended to the common editions of Irenæus. And if he had read this sole remnant of Ptolemy, he would have found its argument and its whole substance a congeries of heretical notions on the mingled character of truth and falsehood in the books of Moses: of Ptolemy's being "hereticated" he could have had no doubt.

III. But he would not have found the reading that we have marked (5) in Ptolemy—at least, we have sought it carefully in the very few pages that remain of Ptolemy—without finding it. He would, however, find it, where no doubt his author found it, in Irenæus.^c And how came it there? It is introduced *among a collection of passages of Scripture perverted by the heretics*.

Let us review Dr. Davidson's charge. The most subtle and dangerous corruptions, he says, were those which arose within the Church; for if introduced by Catholics, they were connived at: and the evidence that in such cases they were connived at, is the instance of Ptolemy: and Ptolemy proves to be a notorious heretic, who yet only perverted the text of Scripture by citing it loosely, as appears from all the instances cited. There is one exception; and in this one excepted case the alteration was *not connived at*: for the fact is known to us only from the severe animadversions of St. Irenæus, in a place wherein he is making good his charge against heretics, of perverting the text of Scripture—Ptolemy and his school being especially aimed at.

This passage of Dr. Davidson's came across the writer of

^c Dr. Davidson gives the general reference thus,—Ptolemæi ep. ad. Floram, apud Epiphani, oper., p. 216, ed Petav. He must have copied the reference as well as the the places.

these words as he was reading Dr. D.'s work on Biblical Criticism. He was surprised at it, investigated it, and gives to theological readers the result. *Ex hoc disce omnia*.

The conviction on his own mind is that, however learned Dr. Davidson may be in Oriental languages, however useful a compiler and arranger of materials derived from others, his statements need to be very closely sifted; and that in the whole of the portion of his work now referred to, he is biassed by a wish to represent the orthodox Christians of the second century as indifferent to the corruption of the text of the New Testament, provided the corruptions were made by their friends—a representation eminently calculated to lessen our confidence in the correctness of the text handed down to us—a confidence which has hitherto been supported by the known jealousy and almost superstitious care with which they *tried* to exclude corruption.

Oxford.

S. T. P.

. S. T. P. should, perhaps, have given more than this case of incorrectness to justify his sweeping generalization, *Ex hoc disce omnia*. But the way in which many writers shelter their negligence of statement under a presumed darkness or indefiniteness in early Church History, requires to be guarded against, and needs exposure.

It appears to be thought by them that because the documentary evidence furnished by the first centuries is comparatively brief, and shrouded in a hoar antiquity, it therefore does not admit of scientific treatment:—a train of thought quite contrary to that which is made to bear on old classical writers. This looseness of conception on ecclesiastical subjects of former ages, is greatly fostered by the habit of depreciating the mental qualities of the early Church Fathers, into which some sections of the visible Church have unhappily fallen. The *proper* method, of course, is, to use care and exactness of research just in proportion as the documents are few, or doubtful in their meaning.

As to the incorrect quotations and references which are found in Dr. Davidson's translation of Gieseler, we take this opportunity of remarking upon the frequent deficiency of editorial oversight in the volumes of the Foreign Theological Library, to which that translation belongs. Messrs. Clark, of Edinburgh, have conferred a great boon on English scholars by their library, but we have again and again noticed the glaring errors which

have been allowed to remain, which no moderately competent corrector of the press could have suffered to escape him. We adduce one example as a specimen of very many errors of the same kind. In Vol. III. of Olshausen's *Commentary on the Gospels*, page 302, a beautiful Latin Hymn is quoted, and the line *Evolavit altius*, is given thus:—*Goolavit altius!!* Extreme carelessness seems to have pervaded the execution of the volume at large, for the date of the book is 1869, instead of 1849!

With regard to Dr. Davidson, our wish has been to deal fairly with him, not only on the general ground of Christian propriety, but also because of his acknowledged services to sacred literature, imperfect as they may be in some particulars. On this account we have admitted into the Correspondence department of the present number an eloquent defence of him, in relation to the part supplied by him to the new Edition of Horne's *Introduction to the New Testament*. Biblical studies, conducted with anything like critical freedom, are so rare among us in the present day, that those who do pursue them must be respected, notwithstanding their imperfections.—ED. J. S. L.

THREE MONTHS IN THE HOLY LAND.

(Continued from No. VII., p. 35.)

CHAP. XX.—*Departure from Hebron—El-Burāk, or Solomon's Pools—Bethlehem, and the Convent of Mar Saba.*

WE were up and ready to start as the first ray of sunshine peered from above the hills in the far East, shedding abroad at once the light and life so entirely of Eastern birth! How fresh was the air, still damp of the night, as it stirred around, and softly waved the shrubs of gumcistus that covered the ground, only to carry far and wide the fragrance of its delicious smell! There is a peculiar feel and freshness about early morn in the East, which is unknown in our western climes. You see then nature breathe again, and its breath is — without figure of speech—fragrant.

There was enough then to put me and even my Arab servants in good spirits; for even they were not insensible to beauties of nature with which they are familiar. Sunrise is the most important as it is the first event in their day's toil, such as it is. They rise before it, and calculate from it, both the length and distance of their day's journey. And "talā't-es-shams," or "the rising of the sun," is heard oftener from the mouth of the Arab way-faring men, than "What shall we eat or drink?" for their food is scanty; and as to their drink they find it at every stream or fountain they come to. Muhammed then meant what he said when mounting his horse, he said to me in his quiet Arab way: "Khawājah! el-hawa melieh el-yōm." "Sir, the weather is charming," or more properly, "the air is delicious to-day."

So it was; and we all enjoyed it as such. Even our horses sniffed the breath of morn with apparent pleasure, and trod the turf with more elastic step; and my servants began to sing some of their native songs, in which their Arab companions occasionally joined in a chorus of rough melodies; like themselves, independent and wild echoes of their desert hills. Thus did we saunter along over hill and dale, in this the neighbourhood of Eschol, between sloping hills and rounded hillocks covered with vineyards in luxuriant leaf; and with abundant crops of corn that waved slowly in the breeze of day. Here wheat is sown without toil; it grows without let or hindrance from a fitful or fickle climate, and when ripe, it is cut and stored without loss or trouble. For the land is still blessed; it is "the

land the Lord careth for;" and it yields even now, a hundred-fold to the listless labourer for his pains. Were it not for this, some of the owners of corn fields in remote situations might find themselves disappointed in their hopes of harvest. For I could not help wondering at the extreme coolness with which my Arab attendants, sheikh and all, turned their horses into every field of green wheat they came to on the road; let them eat their full; and then went on. This mode of providing for their horses, which, as far as I could judge, prevails among the Arab community, explains partly the little cost at which they rear and keep their favourite steeds. A remnant, it must be owned, of very primitive times.

Somewhere then, not far from this immediate neighbourhood, the spies from the camp must have come and gathered the grapes which they took back to the faint-hearted Israelites, as a foretaste of the land flowing with milk and honey which the Lord had promised them. Here, too, dwelt the dreaded sons of Anak; those giant foes, in sight of whom the people of God forgot Him who had led them thus far on their way, amid dangers and privations staved off by miracles wrought in their behalf; and their hearts sank within them, and their courage gave way, when they heard that ere they could rest in the plains of Mamre or gather grapes in the vineyards of Eshcol, they must have fought and overcome their enemies. And they would rather not rest than venture in fight under the banner of the LORD OF Hosts! So they neither fought, nor overcame; but they lost that blessed land, and came short of the rest that remained for them.

As we travelled further from Hebron, the vineyards gradually gave place to low evergreen shrubs, which almost entirely covered the undulating hills among which we were. Here and there was a patch of green grass, never without a flock of sheep and goats, and a shepherd to watch them; a shepherd as wild-looking and as rough in appearance as the sheep he tended; not only as shepherd, but as surgeon also! For here I noticed an unfortunate goat in particular, which had lost one of its hind-legs from the hough-joint very recently; for the limb was raw and bleeding. Yet the poor animal seemed to suffer little pain, and to graze as comfortably as if nothing had happened; thanks to the ingenious contrivance of the shepherd. It consisted of the stem of a shrub a few inches long, cut where three side twigs branched off. The stump of the goat's hind limb was fixed between these diverging twigs, and firmly tied to them with grass; the stem itself answering the part of a wooden leg. No cripple ever did better than this goat of Hebron, which lost a

limb apparently with little pain, and got another at very little expense.

This was near a bright clear fountain at Beth-zur. How it gurgled from the earth and flowed a sparkling brook amid the tufts of alyssum in full bloom that overshadowed its banks! Some one of old had made a basin of large and rude masonry, to gather its waters in one deep abundant well of delicious draught for the weary way-faring man, who might learn, by the side of this well, the full meaning of the Psalmist's words: "All my fresh springs shall be in thee." But long since, the stream had broken through the shackles imposed by human will; it had forsaken its narrow bed of stone, and now it flowed unhindered through the grass fresh and green, that seemed to live by it. This was too tempting a resting-place—though none of us were tired—for my Arabs to pass on. "Nestarieh! Let us rest, or breathe, a little!" said Muhammed; and in a moment we were all here and there on the turf, and our horses allowed to wander and graze at leisure.

We rested, then, or rather we waited patiently, till about an hour had passed, and then, at Muhammed's command, "Nem-shoo! Let us walk on!" we all stood up, girt our steeds, and mounted them in a trice. It was some time in the early part of the day, perhaps near nine o'clock, judging from the sun; but none of us, of course, could tell within an hour or so. And this is one of the charms of Eastern travel, never to know the time. You feel in no hurry, ignorant as you are of the distance to be gone through; you take things as they come, knowing, from experience, that it is of no use to take them otherwise, and so you travel at leisure; and that alone is travelling. That alone is rest to the mind, and health to the body; when and where your horse is your only conveyance, your tent your only dwelling, which you pitch and strike where and when you please, and safe from Vagrant Acts. It is mere mockery to send a weary head and overworked brain to "travel," as it is called, from one town to another, in the din, hurry, and bustle of engines and railway-carriages. It only makes matters worse. But, oh! for a breath of desert air! for a month of Eastern life! for a hundred miles, only one short hundred miles of wandering over the hills and dales of that land where the sun shines ever bright in his own blue sky, and the breath of eve fans us to sleep under the shade of the palm! where it rustles in the olive-leaf, and ripples the brook that murmurs of olden days;—from whence we too have had our beginning.

We left Beth-zur, and, following our route amid a succession of low hills covered with bushes—a fair landscape of Judah—we

reached remarkable remains of ancient days; I mean the three reservoirs that go by the name of El-Burâk, or "The Pools," it is said, "of Solomon." They consist of three large tanks of a square form, one higher than the other, and each many hundred feet long, by several hundred feet wide; situated between two hills, and fed by a stream that rises in the immediate neighbourhood, and empties itself in them by a canal cut in the rock. Those tanks are still in a tolerable state of preservation; the lining coat of mortar or cement being, in many places, still so good as to allow them to hold water. They were intended to supply Jerusalem with water, by means of an aqueduct of remarkable construction, which went round by Bethlehem to the upper pool of Gihon. And those tanks, together with the aqueduct attached to them, are, like many other monuments, attributed to Solomon; with what degree of probability I cannot tell. Whatever their origin be, however, they are objects of great interest; and, coming upon them, as we did, unexpectedly, at the turning of a hill, the feeling of surprise invested them in my mind with a degree of the marvellous; and I sat down and made a sketch of them with as much love as if the name of their royal founder had been written in old Hebrew letters on the face of their walls.

From these pools, passing over undulating ground covered with gum-cistus and other aromatic shrubs, we soon reached Bethlehem, distant only two or three miles. We entered it at the gate on the road to Jerusalem, and went straight to the house of Sheikh Yousouf, who asked me to dinner, or, I should rather say, to eat bread and to drink water with him. What the "dinner" consisted of, matters not, of course. It was right humble fare, but received gratefully at the hand of my host, in "the town of Bethlehem." For I did not travel in the East as I should expect to do in Europe; if to go from one hotel to another, done or cheated, can be called "travelling." Neither was my object to ascertain sites about which no one knows, or will ever know, anything; or to fight others about the title of one stone to one particular building rather than to another, which probably never existed. But I sought to forget the West as much as possible in the realities of the East. I tried to study, not modern walls, but everlasting hills, and to identify myself with sites and places which have not changed their name since they were first marked out in the days of Abraham—aye! and before him too!—of David, may be of Solomon; and especially hallowed by the footprints of the Son of God. I sought in the manners and customs of the people among which I moved remnants of manners and customs of

Scriptural stamp; and in their ancient and manly tongue, the sounds familiar to former inhabitants of the land. I found both to some extent, and from both I derived instruction which enables me to understand better the Word of God.

It was, then, with such feelings, and for such a purpose, that I sat in an upper room in my host's house, and there, with him, dipped my hand in the dish, for there was only one; after which, water was poured upon my hands first, then upon his, and we rose from table, or rather from the ground, in no wise hindered from following our journey at once by the length or the nature of our meal. The horses too were in the yard, already tethered and laden, and my wild-looking attendants only waited for the word of command from their leader in order to start.

But, before we go, I must pay, though, I confess, reluctantly, a tribute to public opinion, and go to the so-called Church of the Nativity. If I could have *believed* it was the place over which the inn stood, where the LORD JESUS CHRIST was born in deepest humility, then, indeed, I would have prayed that I might live and die on that spot. But as to the place, "it knoweth it no more," of course; and as to the church, as it now is, with its lamps and gold and silver ornaments, it is so unlike what things must have been, that no imagination that does not lie can possibly realize to itself any of the circumstances mentioned by the evangelists, when attempting to worship in this place. This church, like that of the Sepulchre at Jerusalem, or of the Annunciation at Nazareth, or Joseph's shop there, and hundred other such localities, which are monuments of ignorance and of pious fraud, cannot interest one who looks for truth, and not for lies—for reality, and not for fancy.

I was satisfied with being at Bethlehem Ephratah, the "City of David," the site and name of which I could believe, with greater faith, had remained unchanged since his days. I could picture to myself how its olden buildings, even the house of Jesse, flat-roofed as these now were, lay scattered in small groups on the brow and slope of the hill on which the town is built at present. For towns, especially towns of this kind, do not easily shift from one place to another. And I could look for the wilderness in which the son of Jesse tended his sheep; especially when I met at the entrance of Bethlehem a young shepherd of a ruddy countenance, with his staff in his hand, and his wallet at his side, returning with his sheep from the neighbouring hills. Now I treasured this recollection rather than that of the church; for I drew the shepherd, unknown to him, as he went by; but the church will find no room among my sketches. The shepherd, with his staff, his wallet, and his

flock, was a reality at Bethlehem; not so the Church of the Nativity, which stands nobody knows where. And it was now wheat harvest: and as the cultivated ground around Bethlehem is very limited, and the pasture land also scanty, I could turn with probability to the fields of Boaz, where Ruth gleaned for her mother-in-law; and to the fields where the shepherds watched their flocks by night, when the angel "brought them good tidings of great joy," for on that day was born, "in the city of David, a SAVIOUR, which is CHRIST the LORD."

These thoughts were uppermost in my mind when I entered the convent of the Church of the Nativity. It was then the week of the Armenians, who occupy a portion of its enclosure, and one of whom I met as I entered the porch. I greeted him in his own tongue, at which he appeared evidently taken by surprise. He returned the salutation, but with so much earnestness, that, ere we should see the church, he insisted on presenting me to the superior of the convent, into whose presence he led me up a flight of steps, and through a spacious passage into an inner and well-arranged chamber. The venerable priest rose at my approach, and, with true Eastern courtesy, bid me come near and sit by his side. We then entered into conversation, while the monk who had brought me in fetched and handed sweetmeats and fresh water—the usual Eastern fare at early visits—with unfeigned kindness and civility. I did not tarry long, for I had a day's journey before me; and, taking leave of the superior, I was led down stairs by the same monk who had brought me up, and by him shewn all over the church, which has so often been described by travellers more credulous than myself, that I shall say nothing of it here.

As soon as I returned to Yousouf's house, we got ready, and started at once for the convent of Mar Saba, on our way to the Dead Sea. First down the hill upon which stands Bethlehem, and across fields of standing corn, which was being fast cut and carried, and then up steep and rugged ascents, and down equally deep ravines of desert-land, evidently of volcanic origin if we are to judge from the distorted and vitrified state of the rocks. From the top of one of these hills we surveyed the country round, over which the sun was pouring a flood of rich light, as he sank in the west. To see his golden beams stream over the land, tip the rounded knolls of desert mounds, then cast long deep blue shadows, that mingled in the far east with the greyish horizon of the hills of Moab; and to listen to the evening breeze as it stirred among the parched grass and wooed the silvery blossoms of the sand-statice in deep solemn silence—when nature heaves the first breath of rest at the approach of night—

and all this in the land of Judah! Ah! wearied head and languid heart; if thou wilt seek real pleasure and refreshing rest, go thither, and thou wilt find it!

The shades of evening were fast falling over the earth when we reached the gate of the convent of Mar Saba. The gate was opened by the porter, and we were—or, I should rather say I was—received by a jolly-looking monk, with glass and bottle in hand, and evident marks on his face of being addicted to drinking; a sight which took me altogether by surprise. He first offered me a glass of wine out of the same glass in which he had been drinking; but I declined it, to his great astonishment. He then deposited his liquor in a safe place, and went on to shew me the quarters I was to occupy. The key, however, was not to be found, so that I had to sleep in another and less spacious room, than the one intended for me. My servants, who were to remain outside the walls of the convent, brought in my bed, which was spread upon the floor; and while my supper was being prepared somewhere by one of the fraternity, my red-nosed friend offered to shew me the convent.

He took me first across the yard to the church, in which there is a colossal image of OUR SAVIOUR; and then through narrow passages, and down endless flights of steps, to the bed of the torrent, over which the fabric of the convent, a huge mass of buildings, rises tier upon tier against the side of the hill. Meanwhile, my guide told me wonderful stories of St. Saba and the lion, most of which I did not believe, and for the particulars of which I must refer my readers to other books of travel. Whether it was the result of previous potations or not I cannot tell, but sure it is that he was a very fast talker, and like all fast talkers, invented a good deal. He brought me at last, however, to what at that time interested me most (for I was hungry and tired), namely, the hall, where I found food ready for me. On the way thither we passed through one of their oratories, where several Greeks were at vespers, some kneeling, others counting their beads, and others intent on kissing the skulls of deceased members of the company celebrated among them for their good deeds, or their benefactions to the establishment. Right or wrong, however, they were all apparently in earnest, and all at worship.

I sat down to supper; my guide chatting all the time in modern Greek, evidently the worse for having been long spoken amid the fastnesses of the desert of Judah. For his accent was worn out, his articulation indistinct, and his vocabulary, though originally genuine Sciote, so much intermingled with Arabic words, that it required more attention and gravity to understand,

and then to reply to it without a smile, than the good man's talk was worth. We got on very well together, however, and when my meal, which lasted not long, was over, he took my plate, swept it clean of all I had left, and shewed me to my bed.

I undressed, laid myself down on my rug, and slept sound till dawn.

CHAP. XXI.—*Departure from Mar Saba—Valley or Plain of the Jordan—Jericho—Fountain of Elisha—Mountain of the Quarantana—Michmash—Anathoth and Gibeon.*

ANOTHER bright Eastern morning. As my servants did not like their quarters outside the convent, they were up and ready in good time, and pressing me to be gone. I was not long in getting ready myself, and soon after dawn, and ere the sun peered from above the desert hills in the East, I had had my breakfast; I had paid for my board and lodging at St. Saba, and after a short farewell to its jolly inmates, I mounted my horse, nothing loath to depart; for I preferred infinitely my tent to the stateliest convent, and a chat in Arabic in the evening with Hussein, Muhammed, or Tanûs, to an incessant jabber in mongrel Greek with a sleek and jolly monk.

We took the road along the Valley of Cedron, made by the monks of the convent, and at their expense; or rather, at the expense of the numerous travellers, and still more numerous pilgrims, that visit St. Saba. It is a very fair road, and the only specimen of a *made* road I saw in the whole of the Holy Land. We soon left it, however, for the faint and wandering track of horses' feet, and narrowest sheep-walks, along the side of the rugged hills, and at the bottom of their narrow glens, in the desert of the Dead Sea; for we were going thither.

In an hour or two we reached Mird, at the opening of the hills into the Plain of Jordan, on the left of which rises a rounded hill which the Arabs have named "Nebi Mousa," or the "Prophet Moses," for the convenience of travellers and of pilgrims also; for they are glad to get as much as they can for their money, that is, to visit as many places of fancied or of real interest as they can in the course of the day. It is out of regard for them that very many spots have been named, and others transplanted or carried from a great distance by the officious and lying guides, dragomans, or pious monks of the country, to whose mercy most travellers are left.

This "Nebi Mousa," however, commands a beautiful view of the Plain of Jordan, of the higher part of the Dead Sea, and

of the whole range of hills beyond, from the coast of Moab, and along Heshbān, Ajlān, Gilād, to the far-distant brow of the hills of Bashan. But I am speaking only of the view I had from the foot of the hill; for it was so hot, that I could and would make no effort to rise more than a few hundred yards above the road which here follows the level of the plain. Besides, my Arabs, whether it was in earnest or not, were always pretending to be in dread of prowling Arabs, which they made out were their enemies. I really did not believe one word of it; I rather thought, and think now, that they wished to get the day's journey over sooner, in order to rest longer, and, of course, to do as little as they could for their pay. But whatever their reasons were, I could not stay behind when they urged me onward. I insisted, however, Arabs or no Arabs, on having time given me for a sketch; which I took of this spot, and of the view of the plain and chain of mountains beyond; a view of great interest, although it was burnt, barren, and desolate.

Soon after this we found ourselves in the low level of El-Ghōr, or the Plain of Jordan, winding our way amid the deep narrow ravines and crevices of its cracked and parched soil. No wonder the soil itself cannot bear the heat to which it is here subject, for the heat was intense; I can compare it, when wafted along by the wind of noon, to nothing else than to the blast from a furnace, in which neither animal nor vegetable life can possibly thrive long. I looked with longing eyes to the distant belt of the freshest verdure and of trees in luxuriant leaf, that marked the course of the river down the plain. Every mound that rose before us seemed to be the last, and yet there was another behind it, and another behind that, and the green trees were still far off, and the sun overhead was sparkling in a brazen sky, and Muhammed was for ever saying, "Yāh khawājāh! El-harr ketīr, el-yom! Ah, Sir! the heat is great to-day!"

"Thank you for the information;" when I was half dead of it myself, and hardly able to go further.

"Nesterieh! Let us rest a little," said I to him.

"Fein? Where? here we are, burnt alive, Sir; we will rest under yonder trees, if there are no Arabs."

"Never mind the Arabs; they are like yourselves. Are you not Arabs?"

"We Arabs! well, yes, but of a different sort."

"I do not think so; I rather believe you are all alike; only, may be, some of you take what you can, others what they will."

"Istaghfar-Allah! God forbid! we are good men; they, bad ones."

“ Well ! but could you tell the difference between them and yourselves at a distance ? ”

“ Don’t understand. Come on, it is so hot ! ”

And after a few more ups and downs among dry hillocks of parched earth and burning sand, we found at last a cool shade and a refreshing breeze on the banks of the sacred stream. I threw myself off my horse, in order to rest on the green herbage that grows luxuriantly near the water’s edge, and I began to undress in order to swim out. But Muhammed forbade me. Again, these everlasting “ Arabs,” a mere bugbear on certain occasions, were the alleged reason that made my guide restless, apparently anxious, and wishing to be gone. Far from spending the remaining part of the day in this place, as I had hoped, I had scarcely time given me for a sketch, when we must mount again and be gone.

The stream was full, and still rising ; for it was now “ the time of harvest when the Jordan overfloweth its banks.” It flowed slowly and noiselessly in its deep channel, shaded on both sides by trees in the freshest leaf, and in wonderful contrast with the barrenness of the surrounding plain. But I was greatly disappointed in the colour of the water. I expected and hoped to have seen a river of clear blue water, gliding in a bed lined with fine gravel, and studded with a few large stones, which I might have taken for the monument left by the children of Israel, when they crossed the river under Joshua. Instead of which, I found a full but sluggish stream of dirty-greenish water, which hid altogether the bed in which it flowed. Yet, it was “ The River Jordan ; ” the river with which we are earliest familiar ; not only because we read of its miraculous passage in the conquests of Joshua, and ever after in the history of God’s people ; but because we read of it also in the book in which we read of the conquest wrought by Joshua’s antitype over death after His baptism in this same river. I longed, therefore, to have bathed in it ; and to have washed myself in that water that once, of old, implied death ; death staved off,—unable to reach and destroy the people of God ; and made afterwards the figure “ of death unto sin, and of a new birth unto righteousness,” when He sanctified water to the mystical washing away of sin, and was Himself baptized in it, ere He made a new covenant with us.

But I must not. The call of my leader was at last imperative ; and as I had placed myself under his protection, and he held himself responsible for my life until my return to Jerusalem, I rose to go. I had rested awhile amid the tall herbage and luxuriant trees of the thicket of Jordan, where wild beasts

were, and are wont to hide ; but a closer acquaintance with the stream itself was left for another day.

Once more, then, on the burning soil of El-Ghōr. Although the sun was long past the meridian, and verging towards the horizon, the heat was nevertheless intense, owing, doubtless, to the low level of this vale, so near the Dead Sea. The tufts of a brittle kind of sand-wort that grows abundantly on the plain scarcely relieved the earth from its extreme roughness, and the bushes of dôm, scattered here and there over the ground, failed utterly to create a shadow from the scorching rays of the sun. Yet, for awhile only. For we soon found ourselves on the shady paths that wind among the groves of Er-riha, or Jericho, where thick and stately trees now mark the spot on which the first Canaanitish city fell to the ground at God's command. This forest of fine trees, watered by the ever-flowing spring of Elisha hard by, though green and flourishing, are only there to shew how truly the curse told upon that city has come to pass. Though Hiel of Bethel attempted to brave it, and it was in the days of OUR LORD the home of blind Bartimæus, yet now its own place knoweth it no more. There is only one square dilapidated tower, and a few scattered mounds of ruins, to point out the site of the village laid waste by the last conquerors of the country. But of the city destroyed by the leader of Israel's hosts not one vestige remains. And necessarily so. For, in like manner, as the waters of Jordan figured the deep waters of death, defied and crossed by Jesus, the son of Nun, who was the type of JESUS, the SON OF GOD, so also the first destruction of His enemies, though strong in a city fenced up to heaven and impregnable, must needs be utter and complete. A lasting monument of God's leading, of His power, and of the certainty we have of overcoming our own foes, who dare us in the stronghold of the flesh and the lusts thereof; if we come to them in the name of the LORD OF HOSTS, and fight for Him under the Captain of our Salvation, OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST. He first overcame, that we, fighting after Him, might be safe in victory.

We halted here for the night, on a mound that rises above the spring of Elisha, and commands an extensive view of the plain—perhaps not far from where Gilgal may have been. At my feet lay spread a thick forest of trees in all the vigour of growth and beauty of leaf, well watered by the spring which the prophet healed, as if to attest to this day the truth of God's word; for, in truth, "the situation of the city is pleasant," as the men thereof said to Elisha; but also "the ground is naught" everywhere, save where it is blessed with the vivifying water of this spring. Above these trees the solitary mournful tower of

Jericho raised its crumbling top; then beyond the barren tract of the plain, the head of the Dead Sea and the mouths of the Jordan; the whole bounded by the hills of Moab, and the chain of Heshbon and of Gilead. And over this scene the setting sun was pouring a flood of golden beams, that made one forget it possible that the land could be cursed.

As I lay watching his last rays, literally streaming from the west upon the landscape spread at my feet, I could not but dwell with fond interest upon all that had happened on this very ground since the time Moses and the children of Israel encamped on the heights of Moab, over against me on the other side of the plain. I might fancy them on the slope and at the foot of those hills, like grasshoppers in multitude, longing for "that good land," even the land of promise, which they beheld and were about to occupy. But the friend of God, Moses, with whom God had conversed as a man does with his friend, Moses only saw it, and his prayer was not granted him to cross over Jordan to possess it; and that because he had struck the rock twice, and had doubted at Massah! What a stern sentence for so slight an offence, do we say, when measuring our duty to God by our own, and not by His, standard of faith! For if that great law-giver who communed habitually with God, and wrought wonders at his Master's behest, came thus short of the rest that remained for the people of God he had led hither, where shall we find ourselves, we poor doubting sinners, who have not heard God as Moses did,—after our many years of little faith and of lukewarm service? But rather let it be, that the law could not make the people of God then perfect, by bringing them through death into the promised land; and so Moses was not, for God took him, and gave him rest with Him. For the Law is but a schoolmaster to bring us to CHRIST, who alone has overcome death for us, and through death has brought us safe unto the gate of His Father's kingdom.

But I could see from where I lay the waters of Jordan standing on a heap; while the people passed the river dry-shod, and covered this side the vale. And I could fancy them preparing for the solemn siege of Jericho, the city strong and well garrisoned, that stood here below in the plain; trusting in itself, and unconscious of its ruin at hand. Then I could think of Joshua at Gilgal;—then of Jericho in the time of Elisha; of the abode of that prophet in these parts;—but, above all, of our SAVIOUR's visit to this forlorn and accursed city; perhaps to seek and to find the poor blind man who sat by the way-side begging, and who hearing it was JESUS that went by, cried—but how earnestly—"Thou Son of David, have mercy on

me!" And he cried not in vain. The LORD stopped; bade him come—and rewarded his faith. And what use did Bartimæus make of the sight thus given him?—He followed HIM by the way. How years have rolled on since all that took place! how changed is the surface of the land; how different we are; and yet how unchangeably the same He is to us! But we feel all this more in His own land than anywhere else.

As I was meditating on these things, the sun sat in all the glow of a cloudless sky of purple and gold; while the moon rose in the greyish horizon above the hills of Gilead in the east. It was a scene inexpressibly grand and solemn. And I longed to have enjoyed it in peace; but a band of Russian pilgrims arrived at this moment, and, utterly indifferent to anything but eating, for which they had little, they jabbered first in Russian, then in Greek, then in both—begging me to give them food, and also a corner in my tent. But the "corner," instead of being for them, was left only for me; for no sooner did one of them spread his mat inside the tent, than the whole band followed his example; and I found myself most unceremoniously driven to sleep as best I might, in a very small corner indeed of my small tent. They were going to the Jordan to bathe; and, to all appearance, it was high time they should; for how dirty they were! I confess I wished they had slept in the open air; but I hoped for the best; and as I slept little, I was up when they left me, with—"Do svidanie," in French, "Au revoir!" But for my part, I hoped not to see them again.

My attendants being ready, I took a hasty breakfast (for I ate most of it on horseback), and we left. Our road, or I should rather say, our path, for there is no such a thing as a real "road" in this country, led us through a small valley or glen, at the foot of the hill Kurntūl, to a copious spring called 'Ain Douq. We were here considerably above the Vale of Jordan, for we had ascended, more or less, ever since we had left our halting place; and the view of the sun rising above the hills of Gilead and of Heshbon, over the plain below, was indeed most beautiful. I shall doubtless tire my readers by telling them of hardly anything but "sunrise" and "sunset." But one speaks of the sun as one loves him most in that land; and it is assuredly both when he calls the earth into life from the greyish tints and foggy shroud of early morn; and when he seems to bid it farewell in his softest and richest beams at even.

The sun-rising thus over the plain was grand; and I stopped some time by the gurgling spring of 'Ain Douq in order to contemplate it at leisure. But his rays, as they smote the rocks which towered above our heads, soon reminded us that our as-

cent of Jebel Kurntūl must be made ere the heat increased. We started then up a very steep and rugged path, enlivened here and there by tufts of that showy plant of the desert, the pink bindweed (*Convolvulus strictus* L.) covered with rose-coloured blossoms; and by various kinds of larkspur in full bloom. This is the hill on which tradition says our Saviour was tempted of the devil forty days, from thence called 'Monte della Quarantana' by the western monks in the land. The side of the hill, which in some places is precipitous and rocky, is riddled with holes and excavations, made in early times by pious anchorites, who chose that abode for their residence. The trouble alone of procuring water from the spring below must have been a great toil, as it was a daily necessity. But when to this we add the difficulty of obtaining food, and the extreme heat of these shallow caverns on the side of a rocky mountain always exposed to the midday-sun, we may admire the self-devotedness and the devotion of heart of those men; though at the same time we cannot but regret their useless life. For we are told that our light ought not to be put under a bushel, but so to shine before men, that they "seeing our good works may glorify our Father which is in heaven." Now those pious men may have done a great many good works; but nobody could see them in a cave.

We continued to rise, with the wide expanse of the plain of Jordan and of the mountains of Gilead widening as we rose; until I fancied I could see the far distant hills of Hermon, and of Ante-Lebanon in the north, and distinguish the rocky summits of Arabian hills south of the Dead Sea, that vanished in the haze of the desert—a very fine view from "an exceeding high mountain." But we turned our back at last upon the plain and its solemn landscape, and following our route amid hillocks of dry desert land, and rocky slopes, we came towards the middle of the day to a few corn-fields—and presently at the turning of the glen in which we were, Muhammed pointing to a small village ahead of us, said "Ada Makhmash!" That is Michmash!

The sight of this retired village, which has kept its name ever since the days of Saul and Jonathan, standing as it does alone in a wild, unfrequented part of the country, was of greater interest to me, I must frankly confess, than all the "sights" most travellers are simple enough to go and see—which have no truth in them. Michmash stands well, on the summit of a hill, from whence there is an extensive view of the country round; from Geba (Jeba) and Rama (Rām) to Anathoth (Anāta), beyond the small village of Hazmaveth (Hezma) on the other side

the "Passage of Michmash." The village of Michmash itself consists of a few houses in ruins, with the usual low square tower one sees in every village in the country; and that reminds one at once of many passages of Scripture in which "the tower" of the town or village is mentioned; as for instance at Thebez, etc. We were received at the door of this tower by the only inhabitants of the place; who treated us to some bread and milk; and after having rested ourselves a little we left; for we had to stay at Anathoth, and to sleep at Gibeon.

From Michmash the path descends a steep hill into a narrow rocky defile, which opens to the right towards the hill of Geba of Saul, where I could see a high rock, which by its position made me think it might possibly be the rock Selah, mentioned in the history of Jonathan, where he slew the Philistines. Crossing this narrow passage of stones and rocks, we followed the path through meadows and dry pasture land, from whence a flock of Egyptian vultures rose in the air as we passed. They were feeding on the carcase of a horse. And the thought struck me then, that the "eagle" so often mentioned (especially St. Luke xvii. 37), is not the eagle properly so called (*F. Fulvus*, etc.), but this vulture (*C. percnopterus* T.) For the 'eagle' (*F. Fulvus*, etc., or *Aquila*, etc.), is very rarely met in the Holy Land; the only one I ever saw was a young bird I shot at the foot of Mount Carmel. While the Egyptian vulture, which is called *Nisr* (Heb. *neser*, *Aquila*) all over the country is extremely abundant. It is therefore more probable that the sacred writers made use of an image familiar to all, than of one which comparatively few could ever see. Besides, the 'eagle' (*aquila*) being a 'noble' bird of prey, only feeds on dead flesh when pressed by hunger, or in confinement: whereas the *Nisr*, or Egyptian vulture, feeds on nothing else. This bird is in the East the scavenger of the land.

We soon reached the few dwellings of labouring men that still retain the name of Hazmaveth, in 'Hezma'; from whence the view over the surrounding land is such as to give at once a clear idea of the transactions recorded in 1 Sam. xiii. xiv.; for from hence the eye surveys at a glance the heights of Rama (Rām), of Gibeah of Saul (Jeba), with the passage and stronghold of Michmash (Makhmash). Then looking westward, it follows the winding of the hills on to Anathoth (Anāta), and from thence to Mizpah (Nebi Samwīl), and Gibeon (El-Jib). Such a view, looked at with the Bible in hand, is more instructive than much reading at home; and of far more real interest than other more common sights. It is in these nooks and corners of the Holy Land that you discover, as it were unexpect-

edly, the extreme accuracy of the sacred writers. And whereas even with a good map, the reading of such chapters as those above-mentioned can at best leave but an indistinct impression on the mind; while looking round from Hezma, one may fancy Saul under the pomegranate of Migron in Gibeah of Saul, following with his eye the battle of that day from Michmash to the defile that leads towards Gibeon, Bethhoron, and Ajalon, whither the Philistines were driven when discomfited by Jonathan.

We left Hezma and came to Anāta, Anathoth of Benjamin; a poor little village, inhabited by no very hospitable people; but of great interest as being the birth-place of Jeremiah the prophet. We were here in the land of Benjamin; and I could now study the characteristic features of the landscape, in the land belonging to this tribe; rocky undulating hills, sparingly cultivated, and extending so far as to enable me to embrace at a glance almost the whole of the "Land of Benjamin." We were now a few miles only from Jerusalem, which lay beyond the low range of hills in the south that rise into the Mount of Olives to the eastward of the Holy City. I could therefore understand fully how the son of Hilkiah could dwell at Anathoth and at Jerusalem almost at the same time; and how he would be well acquainted, as eyewitness, both with the events of the siege and of the captivity that took place at Jerusalem; and with all that went on at the same time in his own land, the land of Benjamin over which he wailed for its coming doom.

We rested here awhile; and I made a sketch of Anathoth, not for the beauty of the site, for it stands on the slope of a comparatively barren hill, and there are about it no features of scenery that one would call picturesque. But I loved to study the outline of hills, and the relative position of Anathoth as regards the surrounding villages of sacred note. From hence too I could see plainly Gibeah of Saul, Rama, Michmash, the height of Ophra, in the land of Ephraim; then glimpses of the plain of Jordan, and the fine chain of hills that bound the horizon in the east from El-Hauran and Salkah, to the deserts of Moab. Besides, one does not look for the same beauties in the Holy Land that one does elsewhere. It is a land unlike any other. Elsewhere we read in the landscape only of deeds of time; here we read, as it were written on every hill and rock in the land, of blessings and of curses, of sorrows past and of glories to come, that shall be rehearsed even in eternity.

Leaving Anathoth by a narrow path between two hills covered with corn "already white to harvest," we crossed the road from Samaria to Jerusalem, which I followed a few days before on coming to the Holy City; and entering upon pasture land that

stretched across a vale opening from Mizpah to the hills of Benjamin, we made for the high solitary hill ahead of us, in shape exactly what its name calls it—I mean Gibeon, now El-Jīb. The sun was setting behind it, and cast long shadows of the hill across the plain, on which numerous flocks of sheep were feeding. Here I saw, as I had done before at Hebron, a shepherd sever the sheep from the goats at even, ere they return to the fold for the night; and I heard him call his sheep by name, and saw those same sheep follow him. So true, and so plain, even at this day, are the words of OUR SAVIOUR, to all who will understand them! I tarried awhile on this spot in order to study the relative height and position of the rocks of Mizpah, now coloured with the last rays of the setting sun, and the village and mount of Gibeon over against it; till at length Muhammed, longing to come to his journey's end for the day, bade me come on; and after a steep ascent, we pitched our tent among the ruins of the stronghold of the Gibeonites, a spot which even at present looks ancient and wild; and in which I fancied more than once I spied an old Canaanite.

CHAP. XXII.—*Gibeon—Bethhoron the Upper, and Bethhoron the Nether—Nob—Ajalon—Zarah—Beth-Shemesh—Yarmūk—Shocoh—and return to Jerusalem.*

A HIGH wind blew all night, and, exposed as we were to it on this high hill, I could sleep but little. The dawn followed, cold and bright, and we were all ready, and glad to continue our journey; for even my Arab attendants complained of cold. We therefore bid the grim inhabitants of Gibeon farewell, and we mounted and rode off.

Westward, then, over high hills and down deep dales, and narrow glens, along a rugged and rocky road, and by Beth-ulia, to one of the finest views of coast in the world. At the turning of the road there stood, on the foreground below us, on two small mounds, Beit-ūr et-fokhāni, or “Bethhoron the Upper;” and beyond it “Beit-ūr et-tahtāni, or “Bethhoron the Nether.” And at the foot of these the wide plain of Sharon, the land of the Philistines—who had chosen it well;—and the boundless horizon of the great sea beyond. The sun was as yet low over the earth, so that the shadows of the mountains of Ephraim and Benjamin, on which we stood, extended partly over the plain, studded with small and distant villages—as landmarks of the mighty cities that once defied the people of God, and stood against its conquering hosts. One might count them: yonder,

on the shore, and surrounded with palm-trees that waved in the breeze of morn, is Japho, now Jaffa; there landed the rafts of cedar brought from Lebanon to Jerusalem. How well they and their course might have been seen along the coast followed from hence! Far on to the right is Dōr, the utmost boundary of Philistia, and an old Canaanitish town. And yonder, towards the south, lies Ekron, Azeka, till the eye looks for Ashdod in the hase, and fancies the site of Gaza, at the farthest end of this fertile plain. But here is the very road the inhabitants of these hills followed when, rushing down this "descent of Beth-horon," in sight of this beautiful land to which they were fleeing for refuge, they were slain by hail-stones cast from heaven upon them; here, in sight of Ajalon, on yonder spur of the mountain, when Joshua bid "the sun stand still on Gideon, and the moon in the valley of Ajalon." Half way down this long and rapid descent to Bethhoron, there are the remains of an ancient building. Would I could have thought it the shrine of Baal, and found his image among the ruins; that we might know, for certain, what the inhabitants of Canaan worshipped when Joshua invaded the land.

We now come to Bethhoron the Upper, at rest in "the tower" of the village. The only Canaanites I find are a few labourers, who bring me milk and butter; the latter of ancient date, judging from its smell; not to mention the flavour of it. But from the door of this tower there is a splendid view of the country round; and it must be owned that the founders of Bethhoron chose a good site for it. It lies half way up the western slope of the mountains that undulate into the plain of Sharon; and is of easy access, both from above and from below. A stronghold in those days of bows and arrows; at present a poor hamlet, unknown but of the wandering way-faring man.

We descended from Bethhoron the Upper into the plain at the foot of the hills, and following our path amid groves of old olive trees, and through green meadows in a southerly direction, we passed by the small village of Khurbata, and a few miles beyond we came to Beit-Nub or Nob, where Abiathar the priest dwelt in the days of David. It consists of only very few houses with a tower, situated, like most of these ancient towns, now villages, on a mound or hillock above the plain. As we passed by, between high thistles in full bloom, a swarm of that beautiful butterfly, *V. cardui*, etc., or the "Painted Lady," flew up, and for a few seconds obscured the sun over our heads. I never saw so many beautiful insects gathered together as here, around the precincts of Abiathar's abode.

Another mile and we arrived at noon at Yālun, or Ajalon.

This city, or as it is at present, this small insignificant village, is also situated on an eminence on the foot of the mountains; and it also has a tower. We alighted not far from the well, under the shade of ancient olives; and began to think of something to eat. My servant went to the village to see what he could get: that was indeed very little. I managed, however, to dine on it; for one really never gives a thought to "what one will eat"—dry figs and bread being always obtainable, and often sufficient in this country. The intense interest of the journey, especially if one is able to converse with the natives, is food and drink in itself; at least it preoccupies the mind so entirely as to leave all other considerations far behind.

A party of natives joined us here; and after their courteous salutation, they seated themselves among my attendants; they smoked and drank coffee together, and chatted in that low monotonous tone Arab conversation sometimes assumes; until they fairly sent me to sleep, which I enjoyed for a couple of hours. I awoke greatly refreshed, for the heat was intense in this spot, sheltered as it was from the north; when I found a shepherd watering his flock at the well. The flock was, as usual, composed of sheep and goats, of which there might have been two or three hundred. I thought it would be a good opportunity to test the truth of one detail of Scripture narrative; and I desired the shepherd to call by name one sheep to which I pointed in the middle of the flock. He did so, and immediately the sheep raised its head above the rest; made its way through the flock, and came to the shepherd. I then asked the name of another, and I tried to call it too. But the sheep took no notice of me. My voice was that of a stranger, which it would not follow.

Then one of the villagers came to ask if I would go and see some old ruins in the village. I did so; but they were only a few stones in a wall of modern date, of no interest. While walking about by myself, however, I found what I considered of far greater importance. It was the remains of an ancient mill, doubtless of the days of Joshua; that is, the circular trace, or rather rut of a wheel or mill-stone, deeply cut in the flat surface of a rock, which formed part of the mountain. But this rock was broken in two, though in the ground; an accident which must have happened after the mill had been in use for years;—and only by some such general catastrophe as that which befel the Canaanites of these parts in the days of Joshua.

Late in the afternoon we left Ajalon, and turning round the spur of the hill we passed by a pilgrim station, called Amwās, or Emmaus; and after a short time we reached the top of the

steep hill on which Zar'ah stands. And here we halted for the night.

No sooner did we arrive than some of the inhabitants came to ask most civilly, what they could do for me? I longed to trace in one of them some resemblance to Manoaah, who lived here: but my imagination was not equal to it. The place stands very high; and is exposed to the wind, which blew mightily the whole night. Had we not been under shelter of an old building my tent must have been blown down. We got up at dawn, however, all right; and after breakfast of bread and milk, we struck in a southerly direction—down the hill—and by the very fields, perhaps, in which Manoaah was when the angel appeared to him,—into a narrow valley, opening to the right, into the land of the Philistines, with 'Ain-shems, or Bethshemesh, and Tibneh, or Timnath, immediately before us; the one on our path, the other on the slope of the hill, a little beyond Bethshemesh, and to the right of it.

Here in the field, and close to Bethshemesh, is a large stone, flat on the surface, a very conspicuous object in itself. It reminded me at once of the "great stone" in the field of Joshua the Bethshemite, on which they clave the wood of the cart on which the ark was brought, and offered the kine, "a burnt-offering unto the Lord." It was wheat-harvest here, too, when I came, and "the inhabitants of Bethshemesh were reaping it in the valley;"—I also understood how truly the five lords of the Philistines might "return to Ekron that same day;" for 'Ikr, or Ekron, appeared on the plain to the right, at no great distance.

At Bethshemesh, however, we saw no one. The houses were closed, and the place looked forsaken. At Tibneh, on the other side the valley, too, there seemed to be little going on; still less at Yarmūk, which had a king in the days of Joshua; and which we soon passed, on the same side the valley as Tibneh. The only living being we saw here was a vulture, too tame almost to fly at our approach.

For this picturesque part of the land is, comparatively speaking, without inhabitants. It is impossible to travel on foot or on horseback along the pretty valleys, and to wind one's way from hill to hill, most of which are clad in evergreens; and to think of all that once took place in this now forsaken country, without pain, but for the hope, nay, rather the firm belief, that the day is coming when even "the wilderness shall blossom as the rose." Then, "instead of the thorn shall come up the fir-tree; and instead of the briar shall come up the myrtle-tree," in this "the land the Lord careth for." We must tarry the

Lord's leisure. We cannot hasten that day. But when it comes no one shall hinder it. For it will be of the Lord.

My intention was to have gone to Shuweikeh (Shocoh), a mile or two further south. But as I wished to return to Jerusalem this day, if I could, and as I could not have gained a better view of the battle-field on which Goliath was slain by David than from the hills on which I now stood, I felt satisfied with a faithful sketch of Shocoh that stands on a hill; and I saw it true that "the Philistines stood on a mountain on the one side, and Israel stood on a mountain on the other side; and there was a valley between them;" along which the brooks now flow, where "David chose him five smooth stones," which he put into his shepherd's bag, holding his sling in his hand, in his encounter with the Giant of Gath. No imagination was required; I only had to look at the country before me, spread at my feet, only a mile from where I stood, and I could almost see the Philistines defying the host of Saul: the giant, proud of his strength and stature, the pride of their camp, coming forth day after day, to provoke some Israelite to single combat; then a mere youth, and a shepherd too, unable even to wear a coat of mail, and unused to the art of war, but strong in the LORD, going to meet that dreaded foe in uneven fight. How the faint-hearted king of Israel must have looked on the giant whom he heard cursing David by his gods! With what suspense must the host of Israel have weighed the chances of hope they had in the result; for some of them, doubtless, still kept to the LORD their God, and with the remembrance of the wonders wrought in their behalf, they still thought the young shepherd, with a staff in one hand and a sling in the other, might be more than a match for the giant, whom he went to fight "in the name of the LORD OF Hosts."

The Philistines, of course, laughed the youth to scorn, as did also their champion, for they knew Him not who giveth strength to the weak and courage to the faint of heart: who fighteth for His people, and who conquers their foes. But the hosts of Israel learnt it that day; and we both know and believe that He whom the young shepherd of Bethlehem foreshadowed, the GOOD SHEPHERD Himself, fought and overcame for us, and gives us strength to fight and to overcome in HIS NAME.

I returned from hence by a charming landscape, for truly these hills of Judah are beautiful to behold—through cornfields and undulating ground, to a village called Beit-nettif, which stands on the brow of a large buttress of the chain of mountains that give feature to this part of the country. From hence we continued up hill and down dale in a northerly direction, until

we came to El-Burāk, Solomon's Pools, the very spot on which we had been five days before, on our way from Hebron to Bethlehem. We reached this latter place in the afternoon, and rode at once to the house of Sheikh Yousouf, who took leave of me, and bade me finish my journey "Mā'salāme" in peace. Muhammed sent all his men to his camp; now that we were (as we had been all along) quite safe, and accompanied me alone to Jerusalem. As a storm was gathering in the west, and the weather was extremely sultry and oppressive, we tarried not at Bethlehem, but made the best of our way home. After a canter along the plain of the Rephaim we passed by the hill of Chemosh on our right, and descending by the lower pool of Gihon, we crossed the dry bed of the brook, and entered at the gate of Hebron, also called the gate of Jaffa; the same at which we had sallied forth a week before.

I was received most kindly by my hospitable hosts; and thankful for the enjoyment I had had in visiting so many places of interest in a country which tells at every step, that **THE WORD OF GOD IS TRUE.**

S. C. M.

PANTHEISM,—ITS HISTORICAL PHASES.

PANTHEISM is virtually atheism. The pantheist, by the very term he employs to designate his phasis of faith, seems to conceal or deny the fact of his atheism; but he is as truly without God as is the atheist. While the atheist declares that he can nowhere see traces of the existence of an intelligent Creator, and therefore concludes that no such Creator exists, the pantheist, on the other hand, sees God in everything,—he regards God as the only true existence. The pantheist confounds God with his works. All existing things he regards as but so many modes of the one all-embracing existence which he calls God. He has a universe, but he has no self-existent independent God its Creator. The theist looks upon creation as a mirror, in which is seen reflected the glory of the great Creator; but the pantheist confounds the mirror with him who made it, and whose eternal power and Godhead are reflected by it. He calls the mirror itself God, and worships the creature as if it were the Creator. The error of the atheist consists in his failing or refusing to see the numberless instances of order and design

which are to be found in every department of creation around him, or the evidences of the existence of a Governor and a Judge which are presented in the laws of his moral and intellectual nature within him. The error of the pantheist consists in his refusing to look beyond the laws and phenomena of the universe to the wise and benevolent Being who created all things, and who gave matter all its laws. He admires the beauty and harmonious adaptation of all the parts of the vast machine, but refuses to recognize the existence of the skilful Mechanician who formed the whole, and who governs its every movement. The error of pantheism consists in the denial of the personality of God,—his existence distinct from and independent of his works.

Pantheism and polytheism are kindred systems. They both arise out of the same evil heart of unbelief, estranged from the living and the true God. Some, by the aid of a speculative philosophy, are led to regard all the powers of nature as so many modes or modifications of the essence of the infinitely extended One. They see in all mental and material phenomena the same infinite substance, and thus they become pantheists. Others, less speculative or philosophical, see in the various phenomena of the universe so many distinct divinities. They have then many separate deities, and become polytheists.

Pantheism and polytheism are strangely blended in the old heathen systems. The philosophers of Greece and Rome were pantheists in their speculative teachings, but polytheists in their religious rites. The root of both systems, as already observed, is the same, *viz.*, the reluctance of man to retain God in his knowledge,—God as a self-existent and independent Being, the Governor of the universe. The pantheist is as much an idolater as the heathen polytheist is. By identifying the Creator with the workmanship of his hands, and denying his existence as a distinct object of worship, he adores the things seen and temporal—the works of God around him—nay, he even worships himself as an emanation from the essence of God—as a part of God. Modern pantheists, like their heathen predecessors, “professing themselves to be wise, have become fools, and have changed the image of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things.”

In the present day pantheism is the most dangerous and insidious form in which infidelity presents itself. Atheism, properly so called, cannot stand the light: to strip it of its disguise is to destroy it. When closely examined, it proves itself to be the very “Beelzebub of falsehood.” But pantheism

comes forth decked in gay attire, and, with strange mystic utterances, claims the attention and demands the homage of men.

“It weaves its subtle dialectics around everything, that thus it may drag all into its terrific vortex. It has a word for almost every man, excepting for the Christian established in his faith. By the very extravagance of its pretensions it seduces many; by its harmony with the life of sense it attracts those who love the world; and by its ideal character it sways such as would fain be lifted above the illusions of sense, and the visions of the imagination, and the contradictions of the understanding, into a region of rarer air, where reason sways a universal sceptre. Its system includes all things. God is all things, or rather all is God; he that knows this system knows and has God.”^a

But pantheism is nothing new. It has come before the world indeed in these times dressed in new and gorgeous robes, but we find it among the speculations of the Greek philosophers, as well as among the writings of the poets of the ancient world. Nay, long before the rise of Greek philosophy, it existed in India as a system which lay at the foundation of Hindooism.

“Pantheism runs through the whole texture of that species of materialism which constitutes the two grand religions of the East—Brahmism and Buddhism; and was undoubtedly conveyed by Pythagoras, and perhaps antecedently by Orpheus (if such an individual ever existed), into different parts of Greece, in consequence of their communications with the gymnosophists. From Pythagoras it descended to Plato and Xenophanes, and, under different modifications, became a tenet of the Academic and Eleatic Schools.”^b

Mr. Buyers, speaking of the Gosains, a sect of Hindoo philosophers, says that they believe,

“In common with the Buddhists, that the Divine Being is not separate from, but is in himself the universe; so that all its constituent parts are but parts of himself,—each living being is an integral portion of that which, in the aggregate, constitutes the Deity,—a consciousness of separate existence is therefore an illusion,—all that is apart from God is only apparent existence, which shall soon pass away. The whole universe is but one great illusion.”

Pantheism naturally develops itself into polytheism, and the pantheist becomes an idolater, as is remarkably illustrated in the history of Hindoo pantheism; for, while it is monotheistic, it is at the same time intensely polytheistic. Every manifestation in the world, every phenomenon of nature, every part of the universe, every passion of the mind, every lust of the flesh—

^a Smith's *Relation of Faith and Philosophy*.

^b Dr. Good's *Lectures at the Surrey Institution*.

all are regarded as but several parts or manifestations of the one "substance," the one existence. These several parts or modifications of the ALL are first personified and then represented by visible emblems, and then they become the objects of devout worship. The modern pantheist may be prevented by the various influences around him from becoming an idolater as gross as the Brahmin of the East, yet his system would undoubtedly, if carried out to its practical issues, lead him to fall down and worship stocks and stones.

The various forms of modern pantheism may be said to have originated about two centuries ago with Benedict Spinoza, a Jew of Amsterdam. Descartes had defined *substance* to be "a thing which so exists as not to depend on anything else for its existence." Building upon this definition, Spinoza maintained, first in his *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*, and then in his *Ethica*, which was published (A.D. 1677) after his death, that there was but

"one proper substance in the universe, self-sustaining, universal, absolute; that thought and extension are the attributes of this substance; that matter and mind, being but properties of this substance, are identical; and that one substance cannot produce another; and hence that there is nothing in the universe but this substance."

This one substance, the $\tau\acute{o} \pi\acute{\alpha}\nu$, he regarded as God. Descartes, assuming that whatever consciousness teaches must be true, derived all existence from thought. Spinoza identified thought and existence, and regarded both as modes or manifestations of the one infinite substance. According to him, God is the only real existence in the universe, and everything is in and from God.

The works of Spinoza contain the germs of *theological rationalism* or *neologianism* as subsequently developed by such writers as Paulus and Strauss. *Philosophical rationalism* also took its rise from the same source, and, after passing through various phases, at length assumed the form of pantheism, and the "philosophy of the absolute."

"Spinoza is the great founder of the German critico-theology, as well as of the German infidel philosophy of the universe. From the days of Lessing, his system has been acknowledged as the only possible substitute for the dogma of a personal God. It matters not what theoretic modifications it has received from the magnificent epecurism of Goethe, the artistic brilliancy and depth of Schelling, or the logical and marvellously nonstructive genius of Hegel, the *substance* is unchanged—it is still Spinoza. Both theology and philosophy are children of the *Ethica* and *Tractatus Theologico-politicus*. And all hangs on a postulate—the mon-

strous postulate that substance is self-subsistent, and therefore can be but one."^c

According to Descartes, *thought and extension* are two separate *modes of being* of the one substance. Spinoza regards them as only *two attributes* of the one substance. Substance is with him absolute being—being which comprehends all existences. He assumes that there can be no substance which is not self-existent and eternal, and therefore concludes that every being which is not self-existent and eternal must be a "mode" or affection of the one "substance." The fundamental proposition of the whole system of Spinoza—that there can be no substance in nature but such as is self-existent and eternal—is by no means a self-evident truth. It is a mere gratuitous assumption, and ought to have been proved. The whole system, which has been reared with so much logical skill, and with such mathematical strictness of argument on such a basis, is false.

Since the time of the Reformation there may be reckoned three distinct periods of philosophical unbelief. 1. The period of English Deism, culminating in the philosophical scepticism of Berkeley, and the religious scepticism of Hume. 2. The age of materialistic atheism, which reached its meridian in the speculation of the philosophers of the French revolution and of the court of Frederick, its chief advocates being Condorcet and D'Alembert and its great organ the French Encyclopædia. 3. The age of idealism in philosophy, which developed itself on the one hand into pantheism, and on the other into rationalism.

Idealism dates from the time of Leibnitz, who was a disciple of Descartes. The orderly and logical form in which Wolfius exhibited the speculations of Leibnitz, tended greatly to give that influence to the ideal philosophy which it has ever since retained over the German mind. The sensational philosophy long held sway in Europe. Hobbes prepared the way for its reign. Basing his system on avowed materialism, he resolved all operations of the mind into transformed sensations. His leading doctrine was expressed in the maxim, "*Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu.*" Locke's system of sensational philosophy has often been confounded with that of Hobbes. But Locke did not maintain that the senses furnished the intellect with the *whole* of its ideas, and his philosophy had no necessary connexion with materialism. It is true that the French school of sensationalists, represented by Condillac and Cabanis, founded their scheme of materialism on a part of the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, and connected with it the

^c Garbett, *Modern Philosophical Infidelity*.

name of Locke; but they altogether overlooked the fact that while Locke taught the sensuous origin of our knowledge, he *did not exclude reflection* as they did, but assigned it an important place in his system. This confounding of the philosophy of Hobbes with that of Locke explains the extraordinary statement of Cousin, that "since the metaphysic of Locke crossed the channel on the light and brilliant wings of Voltaire's imagination, sensationalism has reigned in France without contradiction, and with an authority of which there is no parallel in the whole history of philosophy." In our own country Berkeley derived from the writings of Locke his argument against the existence of matter and a material world. Hume went farther, and taught that the existence of mind as well as of matter was a mere inference, and that we had no other foundations for our knowledge than a succession of impressions and ideas. The Deists of the last century, resting their scheme on a partial interpretation of Locke's philosophy, advanced to conclusions which led to materialism and pantheism. Morell thus describes the progress and tendency of sensationalism as developed by the sceptical philosophers:—

"The first effect [of sensationalism] is to weaken our perception of the Divine personality; this, in the second place, makes itself apparent by overturning the doctrine of a particular providence: next, in order to remove the divine working further away from the world, secondary causes are adduced, to explain, not only all the phenomena of nature, but also the direction of human life; and then, lastly, the progress advancing one step further, it begins to be an object of speculation and of doubt whether there be a distinct personality in the Deity or not; until at length the conception of God is entirely blended with that of the order and unity of nature."

The sensational philosophy was more fully developed in the direction of religious scepticism on the Continent than in Britain. Condillac professed himself a disciple of Locke, but confounded the distinction his master had made between sense and reflection as the two sources of knowledge, and resolved reflection itself, as well as all other mental processes, into sensation. He brought sensationalism in France to perfection; but it was such a system as Locke would have rejected with abhorrence.

"For a whole century," says Lewes, "the countrymen of Descartes extolled the English philosopher, little suspecting that that philosopher would have disclaimed their homage could he have witnessed it. In truth, when you see Locke's name mentioned by the French writers of the eighteenth century, you may generally read Hobbes'; for they retrograded to Hobbes, imagining that they had developed Locke."^d

^d *Biog. Hist. of Phil.*, vol. iv., p. 59.

The speculations of Condillac were adopted by the philosophers of the Continent, and woven into a system of thorough atheism. The sensational philosophy produced its fatal results in every circle of French society. The brilliant writers of that period gave it popularity, and the social convulsions and horrors of the revolution were but its legitimate fruits.

The middle of the eighteenth century was the most remarkable epoch in the history of modern philosophy. Almost at the same time there issued from the press the *Essay on the Human Understanding*, the *Natural History* of Buffon, the first parts of the great French Encyclopædia, Montesquieu's *Spirit of Laws*, the principal works of Condillac, and the earlier writings of Rousseau. Voltaire had gained for himself renown in the court of Frederick, and Kant and Lessing, imbued by the spirit of Wolf's idealism, were about to take their place among the philosophers of Europe.

Besides the Encyclopedia, which was the chief permanent organ of the French sensationalists, and the principal means of disseminating pantheistic atheism in that age, there was another work which exerted great influence in the same direction, perhaps greater than even the Encyclopedia, inasmuch as it has continued longer in circulation, and been more extensively read, we mean Baron d'Holbach's *Système de la Nature*. This work "bears the impression of London 1780, but was manifestly printed in France; also, it purports to have been written by Mirabaud, Secretary of the Académie Française; and in a prefatory advertisement by the supposed editor, who pronounces a great panygeric upon the work, enough appears to engender doubts of Mirabaud having been its author. He died in 1760, and it was twenty years before the work appeared—found, says the writer; among a collection of manuscripts made by a 'savant curieux de rassembler des productions de ce genre.' Robinet, the author of another work of similar tendency, called *De la Nature*, has been at different times said to be its author without any proof or indeed probability; but the general opinion now ascribes it to Baron d'Holbach, aided in all probability by Diderot, Helvetius and other members of the free-thinking society, who frequented the Baron's house and who used to complain of Voltaire's excess of religious principle, not unfrequently ridiculing him for his fanaticism."^e

This work has found extensive circulation even in our own country, and has been a chief instrument in the propagation of scepticism. Written in an eloquent and attractive style, with plausible ingenuity it beguiles the unwary and the ignorant, leading them first to materialism and then to atheism.

"As a piece of reasoning," says Lord Brougham, "it never rises above

^e Brougham's *Discourses on Natural Theology*, note iv.

plausible sophism. . . . The chief resource of the writer is to take for granted the thing to be proved and then to refer back to his assumption as a step in the demonstration, while he builds various conclusions upon it as if it were complete. . . . The bold character of the work has imposed on multitudes of readers, seducing some by its tone of confidence, but intimidating others by its extreme audacity. The grand object of this book being to shew that there is no God, the author begins by endeavouring to establish the most rigorous materialism by trying to shew that there is no such thing as mind—nothing beyond or different from the material world. His whole fabric is built on this foundation; and it would be difficult to find in the history of metaphysical controversies, such inconclusive reasoning and such undisguised assumptions of the matter in dispute as this fundamental part of his system is composed of.”

The ideal philosophy was advanced by Leibnitz, as an antagonist to sensationalism. He maintained the old Platonic system that the mind possesses innate ideas, independent altogether of experience, and that by its own necessary laws it arrived at the possession of necessary truths. The sensational philosophy attached exclusive importance to whatever was without man—it sunk the spiritual in the material. The ideal philosophy on the other hand attached exclusive importance to whatever was within man—it found all knowledge and life in the depths of the mind. Wolf gave definite shape to the philosophic thoughts of Leibnitz. Kant followed in the same tract and left the impress of his great mind on the philosophy of that age. He taught that the conception of a God cannot be “scientifically regarded as any thing else than the generalizing power of our own understanding personified.” Pantheism appears in embryo in his *Critique of Pure Reason*. This work was undertaken as a criticism on the materialistic scepticism of Hume, who denied the doctrine of causation; on the idealism of Berkeley, who rejected the evidence of the senses as conveying to the mind a knowledge of the external world; and on the rationalism of Descartes, and his disciples Leibnitz and Wolf, who sought by a system of pure reason, and without the testimony of experience, to solve the great problems of the knowledge of God and of the soul. In carrying out his design, Kant had to investigate anew the whole system of the mind, and to ascertain the method and the extent of its knowing. In the course of his investigation he came to the conclusions, (1) That the mind is never without certain conceptions, not the results of experience, but already existing in the mind, and that the mind becomes conscious of them immediately on its coming into contact with the external world; which conceptions, as they are unmixed with any experience, are called pure knowledge; and (2) That the senses

convey reliable knowledge to the mind of external things, which knowledge is styled empirical.

Kant divided the faculties of the mind into (1) *the sensibility*, the faculty by which we receive the impressions of the external or internal sense, and through which empirical intuitions are given us; (2) *the understanding*, the faculty which forms *conceptions* by means of thought, conceptions being capable of verification by experience; and (3) *the reason*, the faculty for *ideas*, ideas having no corresponding objects of experience.

Every *act of knowing*, according to Kant, is the joining together of an intuition of the sensibility and a conception of the understanding, by an act of judgment. The conceptions of the understanding, finding their correlatives in the sensibility, and being joined to them by an act of judgment, become real and valid knowledge; but the ideas of the reason never finding anything corresponding to them in the sensibility cannot become valid knowledge.

But in the act of knowing an object, through the joining together, by an act of judgment, of the impressions of external objects, received into the sensibility by empirical intuition, and the conceptions already existing in the understanding, we immediately become conscious that we possess intuitions of space and time already in the mind, before and independent of our cognition of the external object. Take from a valid cognition all that sensation gives, and all that the conceptions already in the mind give, and there remain only the empty forms of space and time. Now, according to Kant, the sole office of the sensibility is to furnish these forms of space and time, and the indefinite sensations which outward objects produce upon it. He denies the objective reality of these sensations and forms of space and time. Space and time are only forms, they are not the real properties of things—they are only the forms of phenomena—phenomena having a valid objective cause in the outward world, though they themselves have no objective reality. Denying the objective reality of space and time, Kant is consistent in also denying the objective reality of phenomena.

The operations of the sensibility and the understanding exhaust, says this philosopher, our whole ability of knowing truth. Whatever cannot be cognized, by bringing together by an act of judgment, an intuition of the sensibility and a conception of the understanding, and hence brought within the limits of space and time, cannot be a subject of knowledge to the human mind, and therefore the knowledge of God, of the soul, and immortality are excluded from the field of theoretical and demonstrated

knowledge, and regarded as appertaining to the department of practical reason alone.

Now the question arises, can reason without experience give us any knowledge of real things? Can reason give us any valid knowledge of God, of the soul, and of immortality? The conclusion to which Kant's system leads him is that we have no faculties, either in the understanding or the reason, by which such a knowledge can be attained. As to the being of a God, after examining the three lines of argument—the ontological, the cosmological, and the physico-theological, he concludes that it cannot be proved, but must remain for the reason, as for the understanding, a mere idea.

The grand error of Kant's whole system is his denial of the objective reality of space and time, and regarding them as only subjective modes of the mind's knowing. This error makes his system self-contradictory. He began by assuming the objective reality of the causes of phenomena; but the denial of the objective reality of space and time leads to the denial of the objective reality of phenomena, and of course of the forms, substance, causes, and modes of phenomena. All our knowledge of nature thus sinks into a vague and undefined idealism. And as to the supernatural—God, the soul, and immortality—the knowledge of these objects is beyond the reach both of the understanding and of the knowledge also.

Hegel (died in 1831) carried speculation still farther than any of his predecessors of the same school. He reached the very climax of idealism: he calls his system "absolute idealism." Thoughts are with him the only concrete realities; God is not a *person*, but personality itself; *i. e.*, the universal personality which realizes itself in every human consciousness, as so many separate thoughts of one eternal mind. Apart from and out of the world there is no God; and so also apart from the universal consciousness of man there is no divine consciousness or personality. He says that there is neither subject nor object separately considered, but that they both owe their reality and their existence to each other. The only real existence then is the relation; the whole universe is a universe of relations;—subject and object, which appear contradictory to each other, are really one—inasmuch as their relation forms the very idea or the very thing itself. The God of the Hegelian philosopher has no personal existence except in human consciousness. "Thus then the extremes of sensationalism and of idealism at length meet. The one says 'God is the universe,' the other 'the universe is God.' Diderot and Strauss can here shake hands, and alike rejoice in the impious purpose of sinking the personality

of the deity into an abstraction which the holy cannot love, and which the wicked need not fear.”^f

Schelling, and Hegel his distinguished disciple, adopted the philosophy which had been transmitted to them from Spinoza. They condemned the inductive and experimental systems, and valued exclusively the knowledge furnished by abstract reason, building upon *à priori* axioms. By this process Fichte got rid of both nature and God. In his system of philosophy—the Subjective Idealism—self became the only existence in the universe, the creator and origin of all things else both human and divine. He taught that “whatever we experience within ourselves, and whatever we see without, are both alike the manifestations of one and the same absolute mind, *i. e.*, of the Deity himself; not merely creations of his power, but actual modifications of his essence.” Schelling regarded all nature as only the self-development of God, and the whole phenomena of the universe as proceeding ever in a chain of necessary evolution. Hegel went farther than Schelling; he denied the existence of both subject and object, and looked upon every existing thing as but a process of thought, and God as constituting the whole process. His deity is not a self-existent reality, but only a ceaseless self-discussion seeking to realize itself. His God is necessarily ever creating. Nature and God, whatever they may be, are declared by him to be identical. Hegel’s pantheism is undisguised. D. F. Strauss is a Hegelian pantheist, and represents the extreme left of his party. His God is simply a process of thought, having no separate personal existence. Strauss is a thorough pantheistic atheist.

Feuerbach’s is the most recent development of German pantheism. In his hands it has become bald materialistic²atheism.

The modern philosophy of France, though not so grossly pantheistic as that of Germany, partakes nevertheless of much the same character. The idealism of Cousin, the founder of modern eclecticism, if carried out to its legitimate consequences, will doubtless issue in pantheism. Cousin and some of his disciples, especially Dr. Henry of America, the translator of his *Lectures on Locke*, have earnestly repudiated the charge of pantheism that has been made against his system of philosophy. But deny it as they may, it can admit of no doubt that Cousin’s philosophy teaches that the universe is the mere phenomenon of God—that God is everything. Cousin defines pantheism to be that doctrine which “ascribes divinity to the all, the grand whole, considered as God, the universe—the God

^f Morell’s *History of Philosophy*.

of the greater part of my adversaries—of Saint Simon for example.” This definition of pantheism no doubt excludes his system. In this sense he is no pantheist. He may therefore well repudiate pantheism; but the thing which he repudiates is not the thing which his opponents mean to charge him with. Pantheism is the system which regards God as the only real being of which the soul of man and all external nature are but the phenomena. It denies that God and the universe are two separate existences. They are but one. The modern pantheists, however, do not say, *the universe is God*, but they say *God is the universe*. God, say they, is not exhausted in the universe, just as the ocean is not exhausted in its waves, therefore it is as absurd to say the universe is God, as it would be to say that the waves are the ocean. It would be wrong, say they, to confound the universe with God, though the universe (*i. e.*, the sum of all finite things), be for the time being the whole consciousness of God. The universe is God, but not the whole of God. The universe is the ever-flowing stream of the life of God—inexhaustible in its source, and endless in its flow. God is not merged into the universe, but the universe is merged into God. Cousin may therefore well deny that the universe is God; and if saying “the universe is God” is pantheism, then he may repudiate pantheism; but he does not deny that God is the universe, that the infinite is the finite; and this system, which he does not deny, is, in the estimation of his opponents, pantheism. “All that is, is God,” that is pantheism. The universe is consubstantial and co-eternal with God. It does not exhaust God, for he is being constantly developed in the world; and there is no God without the world and apart from it. Such is the modern philosophical form of pantheism, and in this sense Cousin is undoubtedly a pantheist. He avows and teaches that nature and humanity are the mere phenomena of God. Morell, a eulogist of Cousin, thus speaks of his view of the Deity:—

“Even if we admit that it is *not* doctrine like that of Spinoza which identifies God with the abstract idea of substance; or even like that of Hegel, which regards Deity as synonymous with the absolute law and process of the universe; if we admit, in fact, that the Deity of Cousin possesses a conscious personality, yet still it is one which contains in itself the finite personality and consciousness of every subordinate mind. God is the ocean—we are but the waves; the ocean may be one individuality, and each wave another; but still they are *essentially* one and the same.”

With Cousin the infinite is the only substance, and the finite or the universe of nature and of mind its phenomenon. There is what the Germans call a false pantheism—a system which teaches that God is nothing but the universe, and that as

the universe is finite, God is finite. This system Cousin rejects. But the true pantheism, or as it is sometimes also called the doctrine of monism, or the doctrine of identity, Cousin does not reject; he advocates it. He merges all reason, all activity, all external nature, whether force or law, into God.

"The God of consciousness," says he, "is not an abstract God, a solitary monarch, exiled beyond the limits of creation, on the desert throne of a silent eternity, and of an absolute existence, which resembles even the negation of existence. He is a God at once true and real, at once substance and cause, always substance and always cause, being substance only so far as he is cause, and cause only so far as he is substance,—that is to say, being absolute cause, one and many, eternity and time, end and centre, at the summit of being and at its lowest degree, infinite and finite together; triple, in a word,—that is to say, at the same time God, nature, and humanity. In fact, if God be not everything, he is nothing!"

Cousin's philosophy is nothing else but a reproduction of the pantheism of Schelling and Hegel. The personal God of whom he speaks, and in whom he professes to believe, is just the personal God of the Hegelians—that is, God, nature, and humanity considered as ONE. His God has no personality apart from the world.

But the chiefs among the infidel leaders of the present day are Strauss, Feuerbach, and Comte. The prevailing tendency of all modern philosophy, when not controlled by Christianity, is to the pantheism of Strauss on the one hand, or to the positivism, or naturalism, or, as it may be more plainly designated, the atheism of Feuerbach and Comte on the other. All modern infidel philosophy is either pantheism or positivism; it takes its form from the speculations of Hegel, or the science of Comte.

Feuerbach and Comte identify the finite with the infinite—they make God one with humanity. They say that God or the infinite comes to consciousness in man, and thus they transform man—not man the individual, but man the whole, or humanity—into an object of worship. *Humanity* is their God. According to Comte this *Etre Supreme*, this human Deity, is, like the God of the Bible, omnipresent, omniscient, omnipotent, eternal, one.

Hegel and Strauss, and their bewildered followers, take as their God the universe in its spiritual and abstract totality, but they practically reach the same conclusions as Feuerbach and Comte, making God one with humanity.

Science, according to Comte, has three stages. To quote the succinct and lucid statements of Morell:—

"Man, first of all, he considers, looks upon the phenomena which surround him with wonder and emotion; through all the regions of nature

he imagines himself to be gazing upon the work of some superior being or beings, whom he clothes with the personality and the mental endowments he discovers in himself. This is the *theological* phase of human development. After a given period the notion of a divinity passes away, and men assign a *metaphysical* instead of a divine cause as the efficient agent they see in the operations around them; creating fictitious ideas like that of power, and the empty abstractions which men call nature. In due time, however, the metaphysical age gives way to the *positive*, in which science finds its true limits, and confines itself solely to the investigation of outward phenomena and their laws.

“The French Revolution gave the first blow to men’s belief in a providence and a God; since then the true conceptions of social science, as he regards it, have been gradually progressing; and ere long he thinks we shall have to welcome a philosophy which, superseding all the infantile dreams of the world about a Creator and another life, shall content itself with perfecting that we now enjoy, and which shall subdue the creation to our use, instead of speculating upon the power that first made and now upholds it.”

The *positive* is regarded by him as the most perfect state of scientific inquiry. Here facts alone, with their laws, are recognized. All real causes are ignored. This system of scientific inquiry, therefore, leads directly to materialism. It is just the scientific development of atheism. The idea of God as the Supreme Creator and Preserver of all has no place in Comte’s philosophy.

The writings of Emerson, the quondam Unitarian preacher in Boston, have been mainly instrumental in giving popularity to the gorgeous dreams of pantheism in this country. It cannot be questioned that Emerson denies the personality of the Deity, and that all his writings are imbued with the spirit of pantheism. He imitates his masters, the German transcendentalists, and delivers himself in the dogmatic style of a seer. His whole philosophy is nothing else than a system of man-worship. Thomas Carlyle is a disciple of the same school. He has not, indeed, gone quite so far as Emerson in indulging in the dreams of pantheistic mysticism, but his writings have the same tendency as those of his Transatlantic admirer. The sworn foe of all shams, he has nevertheless taken to his embrace the greatest of all shams of modern times. He has been grievously deceived by the seductions of pantheism, and knows not that it is a delusion. Carlyle does not assert with either Proudhon, the so-called “Bacon of the new socialist era,” or Emerson, that man is the highest being, but his principles, when carried out to their legitimate results, assuredly lead to that conclusion. His hero-worship is nothing but intellectual pantheism.

The leaven of this species of infidelity has been widely dif-

fused throughout the literature of the present day, has infected much of its poetry, and has in no small degree influenced its theology. It were no difficult matter to shew that many of the religious speculations which have recently risen into notice in England have their roots in pantheism.

The God of the pantheist is without personality or will, incapable of forming any purpose, or of acting according to any design. His universe is not an objective reality, which has been created out of nothing; it is his God, eternal and unchangeable. Hegel taught that creation is but God passing into activity—that God did not create the universe, but is eternally creating it. Victor Cousin echoes the same blasphemous absurdity. “The distinguishing characteristic of the Deity,” says he, “being an absolute creative force, which cannot but pass into activity, it follows, not that the creation is possible, but that it is necessary.” Pantheism thus denies that God of his own good pleasure, and according to the counsel of his will, created all things. It denies that God is possessed of free-will, and looks on creation as but the inevitable development of the one all-pervading Being. The creation is thus regarded as having sprung from fate and necessity. Atheism and pantheism

“might seem to be the extreme opposites and antagonisms of one another, but the truth of the existence and attributes of God is equally distant from both. The *none* and the *all* lead here to the same fool’s paradise. The fool that hath said in his heart, *no God!* is the corporal of one platoon, one regiment, one wing of the body of under-fools. The fool that hath said in his intellect, *all God!* is the recruiting sergeant of the other. The *à* privative, and the *παν* collective, amount to the same thing; although the blasphemy of the *à* is more condensed and explicit, less reputable and therefore less dangerous; while the atheism of the *παν* is rarified, transcendental, supportive of balloons, wearing sometimes a reverential nature-worshipping form of mystic piety; *mist-piety*, we would rather say, shrouding you with a kind of wet that penetrates to the very bones, if long enough continued, while a strong drenching rain would have done its work upon the skin and clothes, and left a possibility of drying in the next sunshine.

“The *παν* is the drunkenness and pride of the intellect, *all God, no creatures!* The *à* has been less in reputation as savouring rather of the coarseness of the appetites, a pettifogger for the animal passions; *all creatures, no God!* The *παν* has had some of its supporters among the philosophers and poets, and is in general too subtle and refined for a pot-house religion; the *à*, the *no God*, is an easier, more tangible, more intelligible creed. ‘But as to religion,’ says John Howe, ‘it is all one whether we make nothing to be God, or everything; whether we allow of no God to worship, or leave none to worship him.’”

If the appellation God is rightly used to denote a personal Being—a Being capable of sustaining certain relations to us, as Creator, Preserver, Governor, the object of worship and reverence, then the pantheist has no God. The personality of God being denied, nothing remains as the object of adoration but the phenomena of nature, which result from no creative will, from no designing cause, but from blind destiny and fate. The only subsistencies the pantheist recognizes are but a necessary chain of antecedents and consequents.

“Drunk with the maddening wine of intellectual licentiousness and creative speculation, he may rave eloquently of a Being of infinite power, who pours forth out of his exhaustless bosom, unfathomable as the abyss of space itself, all glory, all living things, multitudinous and diversified beyond created arithmetic, such as fill the universe. And yet by the same right of unreason and self-will he may lay it down that that Being has not a self-consciousness, not a choice, nor anything, in short, of that which makes us to our fellow-man objects of love and hope, of dread and hatred, of joy and misery. And he may then, piling postulate on postulate into the empty air, till he reach in haze and mist the limbo of utter unreality, set up this blind and dumb and deaf abomination, with the crown upon its head, on the throne of him who is and was and is to be—the living Jehovah.

“But this is not to represent unto ourselves a God, but a monster, stretched uncouthly through infinite space, in some blind chaotic sort omnipotent, unconsciously engendering out of darkness like the nether pit light and mind, and all manner of contradictions to its own blank unconscious self; a brute unintelligent anarchic power, and ONE not by the essential indivisibility of a substance in which there is no accident or separableness of parts and qualities, but by a mere logical oneness and an aggregation of diversities.

“But this is not a God, according to the supposition, and of course not a living, loving, avenging, awful Deity.”^h

With all his boasted wisdom the pantheist is like the fool who has said in his heart, “*No God!*” With Rousseau he may sometimes abandon himself to a “bewildering ecstasy of mind, which, in the excitement of his transports made him exclaim, ‘O Great Being! O Great Being!’ without being able to say or think more,” and may thus have a seeming devotion and fellowship with some great invisible power, and yet be *without God in the world*. The pantheist has no being to whom he can look as creator, preserver, benefactor, or judge. He can find nothing to adore, or fear, or love.

Pantheism, in common with materialistic atheism, is destructive of all morality. The whole phenomena of the uni-

^h Garbett's *Modern Phil. Infidelity*.

throughout
h of its poe
ology. It we
igious specula
ngland have th
The God of
apable of formi
design. His uni
created out of no
Hegel taught th
that God did n
it. Victor Cou
"The distingui
"being an abse
activity, it follo
is necessary."
good pleasure, &
all things. It
looks on creati
all-pervading &
sprung from fa

"might seem to
but the truth o
from both. Th
The fool that ha
toon, one regim
hath said in his
The & privativ
though the bla
table and ther
fied, transcen
tial nature-w
say, shroudin
if long enoug
its work upon
next sunsh

"T

creat

coar

cre

ph

le

t

v

...ly diffused. To give it popularity would be to ally it ere long with the grossest forms of idolatry, and with the last degree of dissoluteness.”

The deity of the pantheist, having neither personality nor ~~that~~, can form no law, can exercise no authority, and bestow no favours, and consequently can bring us under no obligation to him. He can control and regulate nothing, for all things ~~inspire~~ inspire according to a law of necessity, of which he himself is ~~the~~ subject—all things exist as the necessary forms of a necessarily existing substance. There is no moral obligation resting on man to grateful acknowledgments for blessings received, or to practical obedience; for there is no being exercising law and government to whom he can be responsible. Pantheism thus contradicts the whole moral nature of man. It gives the lie to that consciousness of responsibility and of obligation which all must feel as arising out of those relations we sustain to a Supreme Being and to each other. The pantheist asserts that men are but forms or parts of one universal essence, and that the Deity is bound in all things by a law of blind necessity, the same necessity must bind men, and therefore there can exist no authority on the one side, nor responsibility nor moral obligation on the other. Men are thus reduced to absolute helplessness in the hands of stern inflexible necessity. They are in all their thoughts, words, and actions, mere automata. This necessity holds everything as with an iron grasp, and allows of no liberty of will either human or divine. The destruction of liberty is the destruction of all responsibility; thus the moral nature of man is overthrown. The actions of a man become, with the pantheist, the actions of God, and he is in no way accountable for them. There can be no such thing, according to this system, as sin or moral culpability, for there is no law, and no judge, and no moral distinctions, among the actions of men, into good and bad.

The pantheist can have no dread or hope of an individual immortality. According to his philosophy there is no separate existence of souls beyond the grave, as at death the soul is absorbed and lost in the “All.” Death is like the return of a ray of light to the sun whence it emanated, or the return of a drop of water to the ocean: individual existence then ceases, and the soul is swallowed up and absorbed in the great “All.”

“According to Hegel’s speculative decisions,” says Reinhard, “the individual personality of man is perishable in its very nature. In his view, reason demands that the thinking individual should acknowledge the nothingness of his individual essence, and willingly meet self-annihilation in view of his entering into that universal substance, which, like Chronos in the old mythology, devours all its own offspring.”

The pantheist owns no immortality hereafter: life with him is but a dream, and death an absorption of being.

Whether, therefore, we contemplate pantheism theoretically or practically,

“it is the most outrageous monstrosity which the human mind has ever yet fabricated or can fabricate. It is the ultimatum of absurdity and immorality. It was generated by conceit, fostered by pride, and matured by the most consummate depravity. Viewed by the eye of philosophy, it is arrant nonsense; by the eye of morality, it is disgustingly obscene; and by the eye of religion, it is horrid blasphemy. It is repugnant to our reason, and revolting to our moral sense. It is a foul disgrace to the intellect and character of man, which it is both humiliating and loathsome to contemplate; and the disgrace is deepened when we think of the man, the country, and the age, with which the system has sprung. A maniac could not equal it in folly, nor a demon exceed its wickedness. The prince of darkness himself, delighting in devastations and misery as he may, could not desire a more complete debasement of human intellect, a more entire wreck of human character and happiness, a more perfect subversion of the authority and designs of Almighty God. Its universal prevalence would consummate the wishes of that apostate and malignant spirit, in dissolving all the bonds of society, uprooting the foundations of social order and happiness, and filling the earth with lust, violence, and blood. We wonder not at the spread of socialism, communism, libertinism, anarchy and hatred to religion; we wonder not that vices are open, crimes unblushing, and the vilest of men are held in reputation. There is a cause! Learning and talent have prostituted their powers in advocating an atheistic lie, and have sent it abroad through society; and the lie thus sanctioned, and ministering to the vilest passions of human nature, has produced the effects we deplore.”¹

M. G. E.

¹ Cook's *Theiotes*, etc.

DEUTERONOMY, AS THE PRODUCTION OF MOSES.

MR. NEWMAN in his *Phases of Faith*, describing the process by which he renounced what he calls the "religion of the letter," informs us, "I tried for a while to support the very arbitrary opinion, that Deuteronomy (all but its last chapter), which seemed to be a more homogeneous composition, [*i. e.*, as compared with the rest of the Pentateuch] was alone and really the production of Moses. This, however, needed some definite proof, for if tradition was not sufficient to guarantee the whole Pentateuch, it could not guarantee to me Deuteronomy alone." A little farther on we find that one of "the two grand lessons" he learned from De Wette was "the greater recency of Deuteronomy."

This supposed "greater recency" it is less necessary to dwell upon, as other writers of the rationalistic school have come to a conclusion exactly the opposite of De Wette's, and accept Deuteronomy as the most ancient book of the Pentateuch; but we hope to adduce that "definite proof" of its Mosaic authorship which Mr. Newman desiderates, not for the purpose of separating it from the records of earlier events, but in order to claim it as a vantage ground, whence we may more successfully recover the histories of Genesis and Exodus from the cloudy realm of myths and legends.

We begin by pointing out the various sections of our book, and the connexion existing between them. These sections are the following:—

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| 1. chap. i., iv. | God's dealings with Israel, etc. |
| 2. „ v., xxvi. | Various laws and exhortations. |
| 3. „ xxvii., xxviii. | Curses and blessings. To be solemnly pronounced on Ebal and Gerizim. |
| 4. „ xxix., xxx. | Covenant of Jehovah with Israel. |
| 5. „ xxxi. | Charge to Joshua, etc. |
| 6. „ xxxii. | The song of Moses. |
| 7. „ xxxiii. | The blessing of Moses. |
| 8. „ xxxiv. | The death of Moses. |

Of these divisions the eighth has nothing to do with our present purpose, and the seventh is reserved for separate consideration; but the remaining six are too closely linked together to be assigned to different authors. Thus § 2 cannot stand without § 1, as it needs the general introduction in chap. i., unless indeed the passage chap. iv. 44—49 is the introduction to it. A similar remark may be made of § 3; § 4 is a summary

of §§ 2 and 3, and refers to them; § 5 contains an injunction to read "this law," plainly the law in the preceding chapters, while it introduces the "song," § 6. This song, as poetry, of course has a phraseology of its own, but throughout the first five sections we have the same thoughts and peculiarities of expression recurring again and again; so much so, indeed, as to impress even the merely English reader with the conviction that all proceeded from the same hand, head, and heart. The unity of these sections once admitted, the important inference may be directly drawn that *an assertion about the authorship of one of them is an assertion as to the others also.*

It is a great advantage that such assertions are so distinct and numerous. The prefaces to the Gospel of St. Luke and the Acts of the Apostles, and the personal allusions met with in the Gospel of St. John, are felt by every sound-hearted inquirer almost in themselves to settle the question as to the genuineness of those sacred documents. Yet the statements in Deuteronomy are even more direct and unmistakeable. Of our first six sections it is plainly declared that they are the work of the great legislator and prophet—Moses.

As to the song (§ 6) we are told categorically, "Moses therefore wrote this song the same day," and the occasion of his writing it is fully given (chap. xxxi. 16, 20). Then as to the previous sections, we read "Moses wrote this law and delivered it unto the priests," and "Moses made an end of writing the words of this law in a book until they were finished," § 5 (chap. xxxi. 9, 24). Now what is meant by "this law," the few precepts lying about these statements, or the whole book, which is substantially "law"? Undoubtedly the latter. The *usus loquendi* is perfectly plain in §§ 1, 2, 3, 4. There is no nation so great as Israel, or that has statutes as righteous as all "this law" (chap. iv. 8). The king is to write a copy of "this law" (chap. xvii. 18); frightful calamities will fall on the people if they will not "observe to do all the words of this law, which are written in this book" (chap. xxviii. 58); the curses written in "this book of the law" shall fall on the individual idolater (chap. xxix. 21).

We arrive, then, at the conclusion that, according to its own statements, *Deuteronomy* (all but the last two chapters) *was written by Moses, and is therefore his work, or—a forgery.*

Deuteronomy, "this book of the law," was written by Moses. This is the thesis we hope to prove, but it is not necessarily exactly the same as the proposition, "*Our* book of Deuteronomy was written by Moses," though doubtless very nearly so. If sufficient proof of the existence of such defects in our modern

copies is adduced, we may readily admit that the language has been modernized from time to time, and that in the course of ages, interpolations and corruptions have crept in; but with these limitations, and they are quite unimportant, we may, as we think, successfully maintain our position,—Moses *did* write Deuteronomy.

Now the arguments we bring forward will for the most part go to prove simply that our book belongs to the age of Moses, and this will be enough. If it be as ancient as Moses, and declare itself to have been written by him, no one will look out for another author. But the most natural way of establishing this antiquity will be to point out traces of it in later history and prophecy. And in doing so, as a fact is established by the credibility rather than by the number of witnesses, we shall only adduce what is more obvious and satisfactory. Accordingly we notice,

I. *Direct quotations.*

We learn from Jeremiah that Zedekiah and the princes of Judah having set their servants at liberty, repenting of their generosity, reduced them again to servitude; and that he was directed by Jehovah to denounce this conduct as a violation of the law, which is called “The covenant made with your fathers in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, out of the house of bondmen.” The law, though not given *verbatim*, is clearly taken from Deuteronomy, and not from Exodus: “At the end of seven years let ye go every man his brother a Hebrew, and when he hath served thee seven years, thou shalt let him go free from thee” (Jer. xxxiv. 14). The expressions “brother,” “let him go free from thee,” and the distinction “Hebrew or Hebrewess,” in ver. 9 of the same chapter, are found in Deut. xv. 12, and not in the similar law Exod. xxi. 2. This quotation proves that Deuteronomy existed in the days of Zedekiah,—it proves much more,—that it had then existed long enough to be recognized as law, and as a production of the age of Moses.

Again, we are told (2 Kings xiv. 6) that Amaziah did not kill the children of the murderers of his father Joash, “according unto that which is written in the book of the law of Moses.” The law that follows is taken literally from Deut. xiv. 6, and does not occur elsewhere in the Pentateuch. The event referred to took place about B.C. 840. But if our book were extant at a date so early, it cannot be a forgery.

There is but one way of avoiding the force of this passage. It may and has been said, The author of the book of Kings is only giving his own opinion; and does not mean to state that the law was obeyed on this occasion as a fact of which he has

independent knowledge; certainly a possible, but not by any means a likely case; for this same author follows his authorities so closely, as even to quote phrases from them which were no longer applicable; and he does not elsewhere, as he might have easily done, shew what law was complied with by any special procedure.

A sentence in Solomon's prayer at the dedication of the temple, may be also regarded as a direct quotation. He implores Jehovah (1 Kings viii. 29) that his eyes may be open towards the house, and towards the place "of which thou hast said, My name shall be there." Now in Deut. xii. 10, 11, it is expressly said, "When ye go over Jordan, . . . there shall be a place which the Lord shall choose to cause his name to dwell there," and the same or similar words occur repeatedly. Of course, then, Solomon possessed and believed in Deuteronomy. As we might expect, arguments from this quarter are evaded, like the last, by the assertion that the prayer has merely been put into Solomon's mouth by the historian: but read the prayer; does it look like an invention?

Still it may be asked, Does not the infrequency of these quotations militate against the conclusion we seek to establish? We think not. It would do so only if the writers of the Old Testament were in the habit of citing the earlier books *avowedly*. But the reverse is true. Though Jeremiah was thoroughly acquainted with Deuteronomy, in upwards of fifty chapters we have only one *express* reference to it, and in the post-exilian prophets not one. The practice of the apostles, and of modern divines, furnishes no real analogy, and Old Testament times are too remote for us to say decidedly what would or would not be natural then.

II. *Verbal allusions.*

It is allowed that Jeremiah is pervaded by words and phrases borrowed from Deuteronomy. The enumeration of passages would be alike tedious and unnecessary. Any one can find them for himself with the help of a reference Bible. Portions of the book of Joshua are in the same predicament; especially chaps. i., xxii., and xxiii. If anything can be certain it is that Deuteronomy existed when this book was written. But what is the date of the book of Joshua? The question cannot be answered very exactly, but it was at least composed before David began to reign over all Israel, as Keil has excellently proved.^a We have a right then to say that Deuteronomy existed as early as B.C. 1050, some 400 years after Moses.

^a See his Introduction to the Book of Joshua in Nos. VIII. and IX. of *J. S. L.*, First Series, 1850.

Between the date of the book of Joshua and that of the prophecies of Jeremiah lies a wide interval. Can Deuteronomy be traced in any writing belonging to that period? We think it can; and though the following allusions are not quite unmistakeable, they have an especial value as occurring in the works of Hosea, a prophet of Israel. If his hearers or readers were acquainted with our book, we have another proof that it existed as early as the separation of Judah and Israel.

It seems pretty clear that Hos. iv. 4, "Thy people are as they that strive with the priest," is best explained by Deut. xvii. 12, and indeed the explanation has been given where its apologetic use was not thought of.

In Hos. viii. 13, it is said of Israel, "They shall return to Egypt." Hengstenberg argues that by Egypt the prophet means a condition like the Egyptian bondage (see chap. ix. 3), and if so it is quite probable that he rests on Deut. xxviii. 68, where, after many threatenings, we find, "The Lord shall bring thee into Egypt again with ships."

In Hos. xi. 9, Admah and Zeboim are named as having felt the destroying vengeance of God, but only in Deut. xxix. 23, is it expressly stated that these cities were destroyed, and we find it there also in connexion with Israel's sin and punishment.

No doubt it is *possible* to evade the force of these references,—to deny the *reality* of the allusions in Hosea,—to bring down the book of Joshua to the time of the exile, and then impugn its credibility, but such violent expedients rather evince a foregone conclusion than a desire to ascertain and uphold the truth.

III. *Traces in History.*

Joshua, in extirpating the Canaanites, obeys the law in Deuteronomy xx. 16—18. The doctrine of the "accursed thing," as seen in the narrative of Achan's crime and punishment, appears to rest on Deut. vii. 26, and xiii. 17. Curses and blessings (Josh. viii. 30—35), are read from the mountains of Ebal and Gerizim, as directed in Deut. xxvii. When it is feared that the trans-Jordanic tribes have fallen into idolatry, the rest of the people at once prepare to make war upon them; but institute an inquiry before actual conflict, in strict accordance with the law (Deut. xiii. 12—18). This same law seems extended to a case of heathenish crime, when the eleven tribes take vengeance on Benjamin (Judges xix. xx.). The Levirate law of Deut. xxv. 5—10, is substantially complied with in the case of Ruth (chap. iv.). The temple is erected agreeably to Deut. xii. 11, which, as we have seen, is expressly referred to by Solomon, 1 Kings viii. 29, and by Jehovah to Solomon

(1 Kings ix. 3). The "testimony" is given to Joash at his coronation in the spirit of the injunction, Deut. xvii. 18.

These traces, it will be seen, are of two kinds. The law in which we suppose they originated is sometimes mentioned, and sometimes not. In the latter case, an opponent might answer that the custom produced the law, not the law the custom; and in the former, that a later writer has attributed his own views to a period too early for their existence. But if every allusion can thus be explained away, what becomes of all historical proof and written testimony?

On the whole, we are justified in asserting, that direct quotation and verbal allusion carry the book back, at least, to the commencement of the reign of David, and that its influence on events may be traced from the very time of Moses. And when we remember how scanty are the records whence we can gather these notices, that many other less certain references might have been adduced, and that we have been limited to what is peculiar in Deuteronomy, as distinguished from the rest of the Pentateuch, we may express our surprise and gratitude that the evidence is so full and complete.

We now turn to some collateral arguments drawn from the book itself, which doubtless, to many minds, will appear at least equally satisfactory and conclusive; but to feel their full force, it is necessary to bear perpetually in mind that if Deuteronomy be not the work of Moses, the only alternative is—forgery.

1. *The whole of chap. xxxiii., our seventh section, evinces a very high antiquity.*

The following facts are patent to the most cursory reader.

1. In the blessing of Judah (ver. 7), we find no reference to the pre-eminence of that tribe, or to the Messiah, nothing perhaps but a wish that he may conquer the territory allotted to him. This would be quite unaccountable in a forgery after David, and still more so, after the fall of the kingdom of Israel.

2. Levi is commended (ver. 9) for an exploit performed just after the Exodus (see Ex. xxxii. 28); and though its mention by Moses is quite natural, it would hardly occupy so large a space in the mind of a later writer.

3. Very great prominence is given (ver. 13—17) to the descendants of Joseph—Ephraim and Manasseh, a prominence those tribes never had, as viewed from the theocratic standpoint, after the time of Samuel.

4. However the circumstance may be explained, the territory actually occupied by Zebulon Issachar and Naphtali certainly

does not *seem* to correspond with the aspirations in verses 18, 19, and 23.

5. The blessing concludes (ver. 26—29), with an outburst of exultation at the thought of Israel's favoured condition, which no writer could have possibly felt near the sad times of the Babylonian captivity.

We know of only one mode of escaping the conclusion these facts force upon us, viz., by separating chap. xxxiii. from the rest of the book, and assigning it to an earlier age. But such a procedure would be entirely arbitrary, simply a desperate expedient for getting rid of a difficulty. Found only as a portion of Deuteronomy, this chapter must be treated as such, till the contrary be shewn. Besides, if a late writer would not have invented it, he would not, having it at hand, have incorporated with his book a fragment according so little with his own thoughts and feelings.

2. *The want of reference to the great events of post-Mosaic times is inconsistent with the theory of late origin.*

The supremacy of Judah, the sovereignty established in the line of David, the building of the temple, the revolt of the ten tribes, the persecution carried on by Jezebel, the wickedness and fall of the kingdom of Israel, the Assyrian invasions, were all events of vast moment in their bearing on the development of the theocracy; and yet not one of them is in any way alluded to. Especially striking is the silence of the author of Deuteronomy, as to the distinction between Judah and Israel, a distinction that probably obtained at a very early time, and which has so unmistakeably impressed itself on all *really* later writings. Our wonder is increased, when we remember that the book contains several prophecies, and that it would have been so easy for a forger of the time of Josiah to have exhibited these occurrences in that form, and to have made them greatly subserve his purpose. *Would* such a man have omitted to do so? *Could* he have been so guarded as never to have betrayed himself by a single hint or allusion?

3. *Certain geographical notices evince a very early composition.*

Our book affords us information, having no bearing on its general tenor, about obscure Canaanitish tribes, the Emim, Horim, and Zamzummim (ii. 10—21), about the names of mount Hermon (iii. 9), about Og, king of Bashan (iii. 11), and the old name "Mount of the Amorites," is given to the mountains of Judah (i. 7, 19). The argument deducible from such facts may be put in two ways; 1st. A forger would have no

object in inventing them. 2ndly. They are of a too minute and uninteresting character to be handed down by tradition.

4. *The relation of Moab, Ammon, and Edom to Israel, is entirely different from that which obtained some centuries later.*

In Deuteronomy, Edom is regarded with brotherly feeling, Moab and Ammon only with hostility. The Ammonite or Moabite may not enter the Lord's congregation till the tenth generation, the Edomite may do so in the third (xxiii. 3, 8). Of the Edomite it is said, "Thou shalt not abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother" (xxiii. 7); but of the Moabite and Ammonite, "Thou shalt not seek their peace and their prosperity all thy days for ever" (xxiii. 6). Now such a view of these nations, however natural to the age of Moses, stands quite alone. In nearly all after-history and prophecy, the relation is reversed. David's treatment of Edom was more severe than the vengeance he took upon Moab and Ammon. The prophets Isaiah and Jeremiah have words of mercy for the descendants of Lot, but for the posterity of Esau, none. Moab, Ammon, and even Assyria, have made to them promises of blessing; but Edom is relentlessly consigned to perpetual and utter desolation. These statements will be abundantly verified by 2 Sam. x. 1, 2; viii. 2; 1 Kings xi. 15, 16; Isa. xv. 5; xvi. 4; Jer. xlviii. 47; xlix. 6; Isa. xxxiv.; Jer. xlix. 7—22; Obadiah; Mal. i. 2—4; which clearly prove how impossible would have been the invention of such injunctions by a writer who lived near the close of the monarchy of Judah.

5. *The familiar acquaintance with Egypt displayed in our book has been adduced as an argument for the Mosaic authorship.*

As there was much intercourse with Egypt in aftertimes, this circumstance is not in itself very conclusive. But if not the *fact*, the *manner* of allusion is very much in our favour; for, 1st, Egypt stands (xxviii. 68) as the one great power opposed to Israel; and, 2ndly, Canaan and Egypt are contrasted (Deut. xi. 10—12), so naturally and artlessly, that we can hardly think we are reading a studied fraud.

6. *Some of the laws relate to the conquest of Canaan* (xii. 1—3; xx. 16—18), and are so introduced, that it is very unlikely that they were inserted simply to give an antique air to the book. To these may be added the command in chap. xxvii., enjoining the people to write the law on great stones, and set them upon Ebal, and the Levites to recite the curses from that mountain, and the blessings from Gerizim.—We have already noticed, that according to Josh. viii. 30—35, these latter in-

junctions were complied with. Now, as the ordinance was not of perpetual observance, it cannot be said that here the custom gave rise to the law, and our opponents must choose one of three extravagant suppositions; either, for no earthly reason, one writer *invented* the law, and the same, or another writer, *invented* the story of its observance; or the command is genuine, but was never complied with; or the ceremony was observed, though not commanded, and the command *imagined afterwards*.

7. The predictions in Deuteronomy furnish strong proofs of its authenticity.

These predictions are remarkably indefinite. They assert nothing as to the nearness or remoteness of God's judgments, or as to the nations which are to inflict them. If we eliminate the Messianic element, they amount mainly to this; the people will sin against God, will be punished in a most signal manner, especially by expatriation, and on their repentance will again be restored to favour. So different is the style of the later prophets (*e.g.* Isaiah and Jeremiah), which abounds in references to persons and places, that this vagueness of itself becomes a proof of antiquity. But the force of the argument is greatly augmented, when we remember how strong to a forger the temptation must have been, to exhibit the great events of the post-Mosaic times under the form of a prophecy.

Again: some of these predictions were fulfilled centuries after the latest date our opponents assign to the book, and were not fulfilled till then. The prophecies of chap. xxviii. and chap. xxix. were not realized in their entirety in the overthrow of the kingdom of Israel, and could not, therefore, have been framed with reference to that event. The calamities of the whole people, not of a portion, are foretold, and Israel could hardly in the thoughts of a devoted servant of the theocracy have represented the whole, though Judah might have done so. Then, too, *all* the land is to be under the curse (chap. xxix. 23), which it was not before the conquest of Nebuchadnezzar, and the people were to be a by-word, etc. (chap. xxviii. 37), to be scattered among all nations, and to endure appalling sufferings while thus dispersed, threatenings which had no complete fulfilment either in the captivity of Israel in Assyria, or of Judah in Babylon, but which have been fulfilled most wonderfully and exactly through the long centuries that have elapsed since Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus. The alternative to which our opponents in this case are shut up, that these prophecies, while nothing but veiled historical description, are scarcely applicable to the facts they were intended to exhibit, and

thoroughly expressive of events their author never dreamed of, is surely only another instance of the credulity of unbelief.

8. *The force of congruity* (on which Mr. Isaac Taylor dwells with so much power in his *Restoration of Belief*), we think, tells much in favour of our book.

The institutions of kingly government and of an order of prophets, not referred to elsewhere in the Pentateuch, had a most important bearing on the destinies and development of the theocracy, and it is therefore natural to expect some authentication of them in those records which form the basis of the whole Jewish polity. What we thus require we find in Deuteronomy, where there is a full recognition of both institutions. Then, too, in the earlier Psalms, and yet more in the writings of the prophets, we find a lofty morality and spirituality we should not look for as the result of a merely ceremonial religion. But a ready explanation of these phenomena is furnished if we assume the prior existence of Deuteronomy, which so contains the germs of those generous and elevated sentiments, that a student of the Scriptures can easily trace the correspondence in detail. Now, as these congruities could hardly have arisen from accident or from human design, they must be referred to one cause only,—Truth.

9. *As, in this case, the alternative of authenticity is forgery, the naturalness and moral earnestness of the book plead strongly in its favour.*

To deny that a man for a good end could employ falsehood as a means, would be, we allow, to contradict history and to ignore the endless inconsistencies of human nature. Yet we may safely deny that a man, *at the same time*, can be intensely earnest and intensely cautious, strikingly natural, and altogether artificial. But this strange ability we must attribute to the author of Deuteronomy if the work be not genuine. On the one hand, he is so carried away by love and zeal, that he pleads, exhorts, and utters joyous sentiments, as if from a full heart; while, on the other, he carefully abstains from every hint of the great events that must have pressed painfully on his mind; he unfolds high truths with entire sympathy and unhesitating faith, and at the same time eagerly watches himself lest some slip should betray his imposture!

10. *The difficulties in the way of the contrary hypothesis go far to confirm our conclusions.*

If Deuteronomy be a late production, the work, for instance, of some contemporary of Jeremiah, we must then believe that the same writer, or another in league with him, also *invented* much of the book of Joshua, and interspersed

it with references to the former work ; and that the author of the Book of Kings has followed in the same track ; telling us that laws were observed of which he found nothing in his authorities, and actually putting into Solomon's mouth a speech that he never uttered. We must further assume, that at a time when the priests and prophets stood in a somewhat antagonistic attitude towards each other, a forgery that prescribed duties to the one and laid down criteria for testing the other, was accepted as genuine, or as useful, by both orders : and, further, that though there was in Judah a strong idolatrous party, Jeremiah could quote this book, only brought into existence a few years before, as authoritative, and give his style greater force by employing its phraseology. The writer, too, who possessed ability and critical acumen sufficient for the composition of such a work, shrouded himself under an assumed name, and chose fraud and obscurity when honesty and openness might have placed him by the side of Ezekiel or Jeremiah. Is it true that the rationalist who adopts this view has renounced all belief in miracles ?

11. Lastly, *Our Lord gives his sanction to Deuteronomy.*

It would be idle to prove what cannot be denied, that *He* quotes it as Inspired Scripture, possessed of all authority. Of course, if a forgery of a late age, it can be neither inspired nor authoritative. To *most* Christians, who believe in the Godhead of the Saviour, this argument will be decisive.

We see, then, that if there be any force in the line of reasoning we have pursued, internal evidence fully confirms the conclusion to which external evidence has already led us,—“Moses was the author of Deuteronomy.” When this conclusion is accepted with the limitations we have already named, the difficulties that remain to be disposed of are neither numerous nor important. These limitations, however, deserve more special notice.

If it can be *proved* that the language of Deuteronomy is too refined and perfect for so ancient a work, such proof will only go to establish the very probable supposition, that it was gradually modernized for the convenience of readers in after ages ; a process that has been affecting our Authorized Version almost before our eyes.

If a few anachronisms are found in our book, and if some trifling discrepancies exist between it and other parts of the Old Testament, they may be readily referred to the mistakes, or to the explanatory remarks of transcribers, which, in the course of centuries, have crept either into Deuteronomy itself, or into the books with which it is compared.

And if there be still a residuum of critical or of moral difficulties, the *possibility* of even wilful corruption need not be denied. That such difficulties really exist, however, remains to be established.

We do not perceive anything arbitrary in these suppositions. The LXX. shews us that no *material* alteration has been made in the sacred text for 2000 years, yet the very discrepancies that we find, on comparing that version with the Hebrew, suggest how possible was the insinuation of some few errors between the first penning of Deuteronomy and its translation into Greek. We have only to think of the times of the Judges, of Saul, of Manasseh, and of the captivity. If the language has been altered, the existence of such errors becomes still more likely. That the *substance* of the book has been unaffected by the lapse of ages no one will doubt.

Should it be said that such considerations, if admitted, would put an end to all criticism, it is answered, that it belongs to the critic to take into account all the facts and possibilities of the case, and that an abundance of difficulties is conceivable which these considerations would not in the least obviate. To the pious averment, that God would surely watch over his own Word, and preserve it from error, the not less pious reply may be made, that we are too ignorant and short-sighted to judge of what God *must have done*. Facts shew he has exercised no such care; that he rather designed there should be room for hesitation, and thus for candour and faithfulness in the examination of the Scriptures.

To some minds, probably, minuter objections are of less weight than a certain feeling remaining after the perusal of the whole book, that it is a production altogether too finished to stand first in the literature of a nation, especially if we add to it the first four books of the Pentateuch; but it should be remembered that we cannot tell how much has perished which was previously written, and that, in profane literature also, the first work ranks with the greatest.

There seems to be some disorder in the *arrangement* of the different laws, and it may be that some persons would regard this circumstance as indicative of another hand than that of the great lawgiver. On closer study, however, a moral connexion may often be perceived when not logically expressed; and the remark is obvious, that an ancient Hebrew would classify facts, and associate ideas, in a manner very different from ourselves.

The relation that obtains between the antiquity, the Mosaic authorship, and the credibility of Deuteronomy, is very close. If it belongs to the age of Moses, of course it is his work. No

other man is known to us at all equal to the task. And if the work of Moses, all theories "German-born," of myths and growths, are at once swept away; and we thus (and we think, thus only) get a firm historical position, which may serve as our point of departure for testing the narratives of Genesis and Exodus. It is enough here to refer to the certain fact, that the whole account of Israel's deliverance from Egypt and sojourn in the wilderness, is confirmed by Deuteronomy, and particularly the giving of the law, the worship of the golden calf, the rebellions of the people, the miraculous supply of manna and water, are stated with more or less clearness; while, among earlier events, the distribution of the human race, the overthrow of Sodom and Gomorrah, the promise made to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and the descent of the latter into Egypt, are alluded to as facts entirely notorious.

It will be a difficult task to separate these events from our book, and that from history. And we trust that the time will come when a free, but reverent examination, will set the question at rest; and when every concession demanded by science being made, it will be seen that history, as well as theology, connects the call of Abraham with the segregation of the Hebrew people, and that, again, with the advent of the Saviour, and with the blessings he bestows.

C. S. C.

JOHN THE BAPTIST, HIS MISSION AND CHARACTER.

"When God commands to take the trumpet, and blow a sonorous or a jarring blast, it lies not in man's will what he shall say, or what he shall conceal."—Milton's Prose Works.

I. "*The fulness of the time.*"

EIGHTEEN hundred years ago, in Judæa, as well as elsewhere, all thoughtful men saw that a crisis in the world's history was quickly coming on. Among them at last the old dispensation had accomplished itself; and its long succession of crime and punishment, obedience and reward, had ended in a captivity so bitter, that wood and stone and the abominations of their neighbours could no longer tempt the Jews into idolatry; but still refusing to give up their empty restless hearts to Him, who had been for so long striving to win them to himself by his mingled

severity and love, they seized on the dry skeleton of the ceremonial law, from which the life had long departed, and clothing it with a mixture of God's ordinances and their own traditions, set up for themselves new idols out of God's very guides for leading them aright.

But they could not rest in this, for such forced and distasteful service is most unsatisfactory and unreal, almost more so indeed than an earnest fearful worship of a God created by a man's own lusts, which as corresponding to something in his fallen nature, in some degree supplies the want which is always felt when the true God is absent. So the night fell upon the people darker and colder than ever; many slept and many did the works of darkness; and it was only a few faithful watchers, who looked eagerly for the promised Morning Star.

But it was not to break out at once; until God had prepared men for its appearing. We generally find that before a great crisis there comes a great unsettlement of old opinions; men begin to feel an uneasiness, and a fear of being driven from their former resting places, and in their fear commence to loose their hold. This is rendered still stronger, by that strange dim presentiment which seems to creep over nations, as well as individuals, when God is about to arise and work mightily among them; telling them, with a faint but certain voice, that little as they may think of their connexion with the Unseen, and glad as they may be to believe that it does not exist at all, or does not exist for them, yet that God has bound up all his creation together; and that, as in the physical world we have forced the storm "which bloweth where it listeth," to give warnings of its coming, so in the moral and spiritual kingdom, the coming storms of God's wrath, and changes on the social atmosphere, will oftentimes foretell their advent, by their influence on that most complex and subtle index—man's moral nature.

We find, moreover, that these driftings to and fro of nations, and tumults of hopes and fear, frequently open out when most intense, and display some one or more men round whom all gather, and who prove to be among the chief agents that God will use in his intended work.^a Such men are partly the result, and partly the cause, of the condition of their time, and the likelihood of their appearance is in proportion to the wants of the age, and the extent to which they are felt; for it is curious to notice how even here, as in other cases, a real want will almost always bring about the means of satisfying itself. And thus when they do appear, they will be the better able to supply

^a Cf. Trench, *Hulsean Lectures*, 1846, Lec. ii.

those needs of which they are, as it were, the very expression; meeting them, in some measure by their own teaching and acting, but chiefly by leading all who will follow them to a might that is higher, and a knowledge that is fuller, than their own.

Such men commonly start out at once, ripe for the work which they must do, as formerly in Palestine Elijah stood abruptly before Ahab, and told him of God's anger: and it was because the prophet was to be the chief agent in the eventful time then coming, that he thus forcibly arrested the attention of the king.

And scarcely less suddenly came John the Baptist in "the fulness of time;" for the three historical nations whom God had chosen to prepare the way before his Son, had now finished their work.^b

To the Jews had been entrusted that knowledge of Himself, in his being and will, on which alone a fuller revelation could be built; and this, spread by them in their commercial relations with other kingdoms, and following them into their many captivities, for long had been working like hidden leaven, doing little perhaps apparently, but much really, in the great work of making all things ready.

Greece had felt its influence. There men of earnest and noble minds had risen up to seek for the beautiful, and good, and true; they found the former, and embodied it for ever in their verse and marble; but this was the easiest part of their search, for the sense of the beautiful clings frequently to man even while he is loving evil, often taking the place of good as an object of his worship. But it was not so with the good and the true; they looked for them often, and in many ways and many places, but unsuccessfully. Some indeed in their search came near enough to see the skirts of God's glory;

"And while groping blindly in that darkness,
Touched God's right hand in that darkness,
And were lifted up and strengthened."^c

But still all their "philosophy was one profound cry of despair," from the many who sought because they found nothing, from the few who found out a little, because God seemed to have "covered himself up with a cloud, that their prayer should not pass through." At length a few rays from Palestine brightened up their darkness, giving promise of more to come. It was

^b Neander's *History of the Church*, vol. i. (edit. Bohn), pp. 6, 7.

^c Longfellow's *Hiawatha*.

by its intellectual activity, and the plain proof which it afforded that man by searching could not find out God, that Greece prepared the way for Christ.

And now imperial Rome was in her full glory, and could look every way over the face of the earth, and call all that she saw her own; making its people almost of one speech and of one mind again, and so more ready to receive the Teacher than they had ever been since the confusion of Babel.

And thus in these three nations man had reached the highest of his moral, intellectual, and physical powers, which he can gain without the aid of Christianity. And the perfection of human art and intellect, the growing knowledge of the one God, and the widest dominion that the world has ever seen, made the way clear for the coming of Him who contains and satisfies all these on their truest sense; who is the "King of kings," "in whom are hid the treasures of wisdom and knowledge."

But John had to pass through the discipline which God usually gives before a life of action. The nature of this can be easily seen in the histories of the chief men of the Bible.^d

Moses was brought up in kings' palaces, and in all the wisdom of the Egyptians. But after forty years' quiet sojourn in the wilderness, he came forth in his old age the better able to deliver his people, and give them such laws and histories as have formed them into the only nation that time and place can never alter.

David, "the man after God's own heart," was hunted about from one hiding-place to another for many years, learning much in these wanderings which fitted him to become the real founder of the kingdom which God had promised, and gathering up everywhere subjects for his songs, and experience for his after-life.

And Paul "went into Arabia," no doubt feeling the truth of the law which these examples seem to point out. He saw the battle that was before him, and knowing his own weakness, and the strength of the enemy (for he had been once among them), he sought God in the desert where he had been found of Moses and Elijah, before he went out to "turn the world upside down."^e

^d For examples in modern history we have Luther, who translated the Bible in his solitude in the Wartburg, and Tyndale, who also translated it in his banishment. May we not add Bunyan also? It is instructive to notice what large and important parts in world-history have been played by men previously but little acquainted with political life; *e. g.*, Cromwell and Washington.

^e Neander (*Planting of the Church*) doubts this, but see Conybeare and Howson's *Life of St. Paul*.

Christ also went through this wilderness-preparation. He was led up into the desert and tempted of the devil, and when the forty days' struggle had passed away, angels came and ministered to his body, and inward strength was given to him by God, so that in "the power of the Spirit he returned and preached through Galilee."

There is a twofold purpose in this solitary life; an inner and an outer preparation are needed by every man who would do any great thing well, and more especially by God's great messengers. Seclusion is admirably adapted for the subjective preparation, and in some degree it will supply the outward.^f A man cut loose from the influence and ways of the world, with little or nothing on which to spend his bodily and mental energy, is, as it were, forced to turn them inwards on himself; and then he learns the great lessons of his own heart, its weakness, its waywardness, and its sin; with the corresponding need of God's salvation and God's strength, of unselfishness and prayer.

Reflection mostly ends in resolution; and self-knowledge is the chief key to that appreciation of men, in their motives and actions, which is the true standing ground for one who seeks to influence them. Moreover, silence is God's great time for teaching; when the noise of the world is away, and his "still small voice" gains a better hearing from the soul.

The preparation given by the external circumstances of this lonely life is neither so striking nor so great. But it is hardly possible that when thus left to himself to grapple with the hardships and dangers which lie about him, a man should not gain in self-denial, in courage, and in perseverance, and learn that self-reliance, when tempered with humility and looking for Christ's aid, is one great element of success.

And, like his great predecessor, John the Baptist had his dwelling in the desert; "growing and waxing strong in spirit till the day of his shewing unto Israel" (Luke i. 80).^g He then came out of its discipline perfected, to lay the axe to the rotten trees in God's vineyard, before the coming of the Great Husbandman, and to teach no less by his simple life, than by his stern uncompromising words, with

"Soul unswerving, and the fearless tongue,
The much-enduring wisdom sought
By lonely prayer the haunted rocks among."^h

^f "Ibi aer purior, cœlum apertius, familiarior Deus."—Origen in Jeremy Taylor's *Life of Christ*.

^g There is a legend that Elizabeth fled with him on hearing of Herod's massacre of the innocents, but died soon after, and that Zecharias was murdered for concealing his hiding-place.

^h Keble's *Christian Year*.

We must now consider the Baptist in his work as Christ's forerunner, as standing midway between two ages. From all that has been said already, we see that peculiar qualifications must meet in such men.

They must be part of the present age, or they cannot hope to gain its hearing; they must live in it and for it, taking its ideas and habits as their standing ground in their efforts for its good; they must have gathered all that which was valuable, and which has been given by God in its past history, and have power to apply it to themselves, and their cotemporaries. In short, they must be able to read the past in the light of God's Word, and, by the help of his Spirit, use the present as a preparation for the future.

But all their hopes and strivings must be for this future, and every act have regard to it; they have, it is true, to build with the materials which the present offers, but their building is to be for all time; and their own place is, to stand, Janus-like, before its entrance, "looking" indeed "before and after," yet crying to men still living to repent, to hear God's message, and help to do his work.

It follows naturally from this that John's history has two sides, his connexion with the old order of things, and his relation to the new, or to put it more simply, his *relation to the Jews*, and his *relation to Christ*.ⁱ

II. *John in relation to the Jews.*

The whole question of the advent and relation of Elias and the Messiah, to us seems comparatively so easy, that we can hardly form any fair idea of the difficulties and perplexities in which it must have involved even intelligent and earnest-minded Jews. They had been always looking for the first, believing that he was to come in person to make all things ready for the Messiah;^j and this strong belief in his literal appearing, must have hindered them from acknowledging the return of his spirit in the person of the Baptist. Yet in thus looking for Elias, they looked for that prophet of the Old Testament, who stands as the type of fearless energy and zeal for God, who brought Ahab to remorse, if not repentance, and who carried the fire and sword of the Lord against all the high places of Baal. And they might well have recognized his "spirit and power" in John,

ⁱ This division corresponds in a great degree with that adopted by Neander in his *Life of Christ*.

^j Even now, it is said, they daily expect him, and at every passover, after placing a cup of wine on the table, the door is set open in expectation of his entrance.

for he found an abounding harvest of sin ready for his sickle. If possible, the state of the nation was worse than it had been under Ahab; for then it was gross and open in its viciousness, but now the devils of idolatry and lust had been driven out, and all was "swept and garnished"—whited up by hypocrisy, and full of pride and uncharitableness. This was infinitely harder to clear away, because, if men cannot see one another's sins through the decent exterior which hypocrisy wears, they are loth to join a reformer in his mission, knowing that, if he succeeds, it must be by striking at the heart,—a method which is unpleasant and dangerous to themselves.

But John went to his harder task in the strength of God, and in the true spirit of the elder prophets. It was needful that he should be one in purpose with them to carry on their witness, and thus bind them closely to the Messiah whom they had predicted. He was necessarily a vindicator of the law, a preacher of repentance, and of the punishment of sin. He told the people that God was going to seek for fruit in his vineyard, and that chaff and stubble could not stand the fire; that national pride was no safe ground for trust; that it was vain to cling to the glory of Abraham's name, if they were not "justified" as he was, by their "works" and life; and then he hinted that it was not in birth alone that this privilege of being Abraham's seed was given; for God could create for him new children, if he willed, even of the pebbles they were trampling on.^k He taught repentance, national and individual, the adulteress nation must return unto him whom she had forsaken, and put away her sin, but purification must commence in each man's heart. He offered his baptism to all penitents who confessed their wickedness; telling them that by their long course of disobedience they had cast away the privileges which once they possessed, and were now strangers in God's eyes;^l and that they needed the outward purification by water, as a symbol of approach to that kingdom, when the King himself would baptize with fire and with the Holy Ghost.

It is most probable that the Jews were well acquainted with baptism as a symbolic rite.^m Water ablution had always been common among them, and soon after the captivity they seem to have commenced to use the ceremony in the admission of proselytes coming over to them from other nations. Some place its

^k There is a legend that John was preaching near to the place where Joshua set up the stones in Jordan, and that his allusion was to these.—Vid. *Remigius*, in *Catena Aurea*.

^l *Jeremy Taylor's Life of Christ*, p. 180.

^m The view taken in the text appears to carry with it the weightest authorities.

institution earlier, and Grotius believes that it had its original in the deluge as prefiguring it. Some deny its existence altogether; but from the analogy of the other Jewish rites, and the great unlikelihood that so strange an innovation could have passed unattacked by the strict formalists of the time, we may safely assume it to have been usual. We know that the Scribes were unable to deny the force of our Lord's dilemma respecting John's baptism (Matt xxi. 25); and this could hardly have been the case, had the latter rested it on his own authority, and not on custom or tradition.

Be this as it may, none could mistake the meaning of a sign so simple, after their law had told them in so many ways that the outward cleansing typified the inward; and, therefore, they must have flocked out to join the crowds that thronged the roads to the "deserts about Jordan," many with earnestness of heart, and more from curiosity to see the strange man, who clothed in the rough garments of the great old prophets of their country, spoke out boldly as they had done; and taught that a change of heart and life, and a symbolic baptism, were necessary even for the circumcised children of Abraham.

What then was the real meaning of this preparatory baptism? and where lay its inferiority to that given by Christ? Simply in this, that the one was a βάπτισμα μετάνοιας, and the other a λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας.* John, as we have said already, used his baptism as a symbol of repentance, a seal of confession, and the death to sin; there could be no regeneration, for there was no Spirit. Christian baptism brings us into Christ's name and kingdom, and the Holy Ghost seals the work which Christ has wrought. Regeneration follows a baptism of "the Spirit, the water, and the blood," thus giving to the Christian ordinance its great and peculiar blessings. But John could see no such result spring out of his baptizing; he could only take the penitent confessing Jew, and signify to him his change of state by washing him with pure water; and then leave him, as it were, a waiting proselyte at the gates of the kingdom of Christ.

If this is so, why was it needful for the Messiah to pass through this baptism? In his own words we answer, that "he might fulfil all righteousness." God had placed him under the law to work out obedience to it, and this was chiefly to be done before he entered on his official life. But John had been sent to wind up the Old Dispensation, and his teaching and actions were all coloured by its spirit. It was fitting then, that he who was to fulfil all righteousness commanded by the law should

* See Olshausen's *New Testament* in loco, and Jeremy Taylor's *Life of Christ*.

submit himself to the divine ordinance of the last preacher of that law. In doing this, Christ testified that his perfect obedience was now finished, and his higher work of Redeemer commencing; and although we have seen that no gift of the Spirit followed on the baptism of John, yet God made everything rich with blessings for his Son; so that this act, in itself merely symbolic of repentance and renewal, when hallowed by the presence of Christ became the occasion for the visible outpouring of the Holy Ghost, and as it were the foretaste of Christian baptism;^o and the closing act of his life under the bondage of the law was glorified into the inauguration of the new æra, when love was to be the motive of the "law of liberty" and cast out the old "fear and torment."

And this was not the only meaning of this baptism. By it our Lord made clear his connexion with his forerunner, and set a seal of approbation to his life and doctrine. And with this solemn recognition of Him to whom all his teaching had been pointing, John's missionary labours appear to end, for after one more utterance of his testimony, Herod laid hands upon him; and when "Jesus went out preaching through Galilee," John was a prisoner in Machærus.^p

We cannot wonder at the multitudes who went out into the wilderness to see this prophet so marvellous in his birth and life. But even he appears to have wondered at the presence of the Pharisees and Sadducees. Yet we can easily see much attractive to the Pharisees in John. He insisted on uprightness and holiness of character, and these their self-blindness discovered in themselves; he taught men to look onwards to a Messiah coming in his kingdom, the one great object of their own hopes; his ascetic spirit and resemblance to the prophets of old time would fall in exactly with their reverence for antiquity and ostentatious self-denial; and they may have hoped that a man who set himself to reform the morals of the age would join himself to them, because their life was strict in external ceremonies, and their jealousy for the letter of the law very great.

But it is harder to understand the motives which led the Sadducees to John, for the whole import of his mission was antagonistic to their belief.^q They would have none of the vain traditions which overlaid the creed of their opponents, and held

^o Jeremy Taylor's *Life of Christ* in loco.

^p Neander's *Life of Christ*, 191. John v. 35, where the *ἤν* implies that John's ministry had ceased.—*Stier*.

^q Neander imagines that they did not come; but were only mentioned as was usually the case in connexion with the Pharisees. We prefer to believe the simple statement of the evangelist.

only to the pure Word of God delivered by Moses. They placed religion in a dull routine of outward decency, and rejected all connexion with a spiritual world, and it was *a priori* improbable that they would accept any new revelation as divine.

But it is in this very fact of their love for the law, and their contempt for the rubbish under which it was so nearly hidden, that the reason is to be sought; for they might have supposed that a reprover of national abuses would find his natural allies among those who upheld the Pentateuch alone as the standard of right. It is quite plain however that neither Pharisee nor Sadducee came in humility or sincerity or in teachableness of heart. If so, the Prophet's stern rebuke would have been unjust. As it was, he charged them with hypocrisy, because it was no worthy motive which led them to fly from the wrath to come. This did not conciliate them, and they "rejected the council of God against themselves, and were not baptized with the baptism of John."

There were more attentive hearers to be found among the publicans and sinners, though John did not spare their guilt. He made it no condition of their acceptance that they should forsake their ordinary calling, if he only saw the proper spirit in them; nevertheless, many of them did gather round him as their chosen master, and formed the inner circle of disciples to whom he spoke freely and fully. They had come out of the sinful masses and made themselves willing to receive a preparation for the Messiah. They had not shrunk from confessing in water baptism the great truth that Abraham's children may lose the privileges which God gave, and which he only can restore; and to these sincere men the austere Baptist was more gentle and explicit in his tone.

They had trusted him, and now he opened out to them the deeper mysteries of the relation which he bore to Christ. Using for the first time the great symbol so familiar to us, he spoke of him as the "bridegroom" to whom the bride belonged,* he told them that the chief honor and the chief joy were not his own, but the bridegroom's; that his part was but to bring the two together, and that he already heard the voice of the bridegroom warning him that his work was finished and his joy complete.

* Alford's *Greek Testament* in loco, John iii. 27, 31. The rest of the passage has been omitted because of the differing opinions as to the speaker. Internal evidence seems strongly to favour the view that the remaining verses are a continuation of John's words. If we are right in attributing them to the Baptist, we shall find that to his other testimony to Christ's offices, he here added a distinct enunciation of the doctrine of salvation through faith in Christ (verse 36, *ὁ πιστεύων εἰς τὸν υἱὸν ἔχει ζωὴν αἰώνιον*).

The eagerness with which we treasure up the words of great men spoken in their intercourse with their friends is disappointed in the case of John, for God has seen fit to give us only that portion of his message which is directly applicable to his Son; yet the few slight notices we find enable us to learn somewhat of his esoteric teaching.

From St. Luke we infer that he provided his disciples with a form of prayer, and St. Matthew mentions their fasting; in other words, these two elements of his doctrine were self-denial and reliance upon God, which we have already seen to be the great lessons arising from a solitary life (Luke xi. 1; Matt. ix. 14).

III. *John in relation to Christ.*

In viewing John from the high ground of Christian knowledge, we find him gifted with a nobler mission in respect of the Messiah. We hear him *heralding Christ's kingdom, witnessing to his person, and anticipating some of his teaching.*

God had placed him on high among his fellow-men, so that he caught the first light from the Sun of righteousness as it came slowly up through the night of ages, and was able to throw it down upon the "people lying in darkness" below.

A kingdom more favoured than David's, and wider than Solomon's, had always been the vision which kept the Jews hopeful amid all their failing prosperity; the dimming of the national glory by the cowardice and vice of the two royal lines, only made brighter by contrast the King who was to unite once again the divided and hostile thrones; and their captivities became less bitter as they heard the prophets by the Chebar singing of a future gathering "from out of the heathen," of "David reigning as a prince for ever," and of the "oppressor driven from their land" (Eze. xxxix., etc.). All this they loved to dwell upon, as they treasured up every promise of their restoration to national greatness, but omitted or forgot all that spoke to them of the urgent need of a renewal in heart and life. Their fault was not in the conception, for that had good foundation in the glowing descriptions of the prophets, but in the extremely carnal nature of its anticipated development.

To change these material ideas of the extent and character of the Messiah's *kingdom* was most difficult, for they lay at the very root of the Jewish belief, bound up to it closely by all its pride and exclusiveness. They could be dislodged only by the plainest proof of their falsity being given; in other words, by the establishment of a kingdom essentially spiritual in its rise

and manifestation; without the organization and earthly glory looked for by the Jews, and yet visible, working with a mighty power and appropriating everything to itself.

John foresaw this to be close at hand, and entered largely into its spirit. He strove to bring the Jews to the belief that the accident of birth gave no title to be Christ's subjects; tearing away all excuse from those who had been covering themselves up in Abraham's merits, he boldly taught that it was not names and national descent that God would look for, but a consciousness of sin and a moral new birth. He said that if they came to him with a willingness to be freed from sin, he would prepare them for that new birth of the Spirit and of fire by which the Messiah himself would confer the rights of citizenship in his New Kingdom; and then followed his denunciation of hypocrisy and demand for purity of motive, because the day was coming when the chaff should be sifted from the wheat by the hands of the great King himself.

But John felt that he must preach tidings more attractive than these, for a mere abstract idea of the growth of an inward spiritual kingdom could never take the place of the gorgeous monarchy for which the people waited; the kingdom must be visible or men would not press forward into it. His witness to the *person of Christ* would naturally then give the very life to his teaching concerning the kingdom of heaven. He could point to him as the great Searcher of thoughts and Judge of deeds and motives, as the Purifier from sin and Baptizer with fire and the Holy Ghost, for whose presence his own baptism had been fitting them. It would give a weightiness to his words and a reality to his interpretation of the kingdom, to feel that in a little while they should stand before One "greater than John," of whom John spake with a solemn mysteriousness as "one from above," before whose coming "he must decrease."^s

John appears to have had an unusually clear conception of the office and work of the Messiah. The remarkable testimonies we find him uttering in St. John's Gospel are a plain proof of this, even if we say that he could not possibly have entered into the deep meaning with which we now connect his words.

To all pious Jews, and more especially to those who were intended to be the great teachers among his people, God had

^s No mention has been made of John's idea on the subject of Christ's divinity, from the difficulty of the subject and the scanty notices of his teaching on this point. We may believe, however, that he who could speak of Christ as the "*Son of God*" and "*a pre-existent being*," had been taught fully of God on this most vital matter. The expression *πρῶτός μου ἦν*, has met with several interpretations. Neander takes it to signify "*priority of nature, i. e., being greater*," but it is far more natural and impressive to understand it, as most commentators have done, of "*priority of existence*."

unfolded much of the typical significance of the sacrificial rites. Nevertheless the nation had, as a whole, but a slight conception of their import; and while they vaguely associated the Messiah's advent with the removal of sin and suffering, they could form no definite idea of the means by which he would bring about this great deliverance.

But when thoughtful men saw the blood flow every day from the countless lambs of the temple-sacrifices, and were forced every year by the return of the great days of the Passover and the Atonement, to connect a deliverance from guilt with the solemn shedding of a victim's blood, it would have been strange if they had not remembered the words of their chief prophet that Messiah would "go as a lamb to the slaughter" when "his soul made an offering for sin" (Isa. liii.; John i. 29).

And it was this idea that John fastened on, and held up more distinctly for their belief; and although he may not have understood the full theological truth which he announced, it nevertheless was the highest and most blessed honor that had as yet been given to man, to be the divinely appointed means of connecting this deliverance from sin with a *living* person, and of pointing to him as the subject of the types of the law, the looked for *King* of the Jews, and yet the *Saviour* of the whole world.*

But John gave no encouragement to those who looked for Messiah as their King and Saviour, while neglecting all preparation for his coming. He taught all such men that the King was a stern and angry *Judge* to all hypocrisy, and that it would be hopeless to think of deceiving him. Such cautions were very needful then; for the hypocrisy of the Pharisees and the self-deceiving simplicity of the Sadducees made up nearly the whole of the natural religion. They had fallen into this as the natural consequence of their sins; the punishments of God for the neglect of his law had become too plain to be mistaken; and now with hearts as far from him as ever, but hating idolatry and the open violation of the law as the cause of all their misery, and the speedy way to ruin, the nation was driven by fear to seek a refuge in deceit, and the hypocritical observance of the very letter of God's commandments.

It was almost impossible to discover the real state of the tree for the abundance of the leaves it put forth; and probably

* "Singulari prophetiâ
 Prophetarum monarchiâ
 Sublimatur omnium.
 Hi futurum, hic præsentem,
 Hi venturum, venientem
 Monstrat iste Filium."—

Pistor in Trench, *Sacr. Latin Poet.*

the preaching of the Baptist was the first warning that many had of the rottenness in heart of those whom they always had esteemed as models of piety and goodness.

And here it was that the spirit of Elijah shone out most strongly in the Baptist; and as he spoke of the "wrath to come," "the axe laid to the root of the tree," and "unquenchable fire for the chaff," his hearers could not but have called to mind that the last of their prophets had connected the appearing of Elias with the "great and dreadful day of the Lord," when the wicked should "be burnt up like the stubble, leaving neither root nor branch" (Mal. iii. 4).

Besides his insight into the judicial and redeeming office of the King, John knew him as a *Purifier and Sanctifier*.

It was an important step in the development of the Messianic office to connect it with purification by means of the Holy Ghost, and to announce that the latter was given by the Messiah himself; for the belief of this could not fail to uproot very many of the false ideas of the kingdom which opposed the success of the Baptist. The Scriptures of the Old Testament had spoken plainly of the need and certainty of this Spirit-baptism, with increasing clearness as the time for its accomplishment drew on (Joel ii. 28; Isa. xlv. 3). But the Jews had always neglected such prophecies, because they were distasteful from the plain way in which they asserted their sinfulness; and had preferred to take up those which were more flattering to their national pride; so that very much was gained in once convincing them that these prophecies which they purposely had overlooked, were most intimately connected with the kingdom, and Christ who was to found it, because it would prove from the statements of their own Scriptures, that the kingdom was not to be *temporal* only, but partaking very largely of a *spiritual* character.

These were the three great divisions of the Baptist's testimony to the office and work of Christ; and we find it to have been the same in kind with the belief of the Christian world to-day, for to know Christ as a *King*, and yet *our Saviour*, as *the Judge* of wickedness, and *the Purifier* by the gift of the Holy Ghost, is to know him as necessary for our salvation: as "the Prince of the kings of the earth, who has washed us from our sins in his own blood, and made us priests to God."

It will not surprise us to find that John in many points *anticipated the spirit of the new dispensation*, for this is common to all whom God makes the chief men of a transition period.

In his address to the crowds by the Jordan, John attacked the selfishness which characterized the time, and enunciated principles very similar to those which are the base of our Lord's

teaching, and are condensed in his "golden rule" (Luke iii. 10, 11—13.* It is true that such principles are to be found in the law, but not in the plain practical form they now wear; and it must have struck the people forcibly, to hear from the Baptist that they must live no longer for themselves only, but that God would require at their hands, not merely justice and exactness in their dealings, but charity and mercy to the utmost, even to the sharing of their food and raiment with the needy. This was very contrary to the spirit of retaliation which the law permitted.

It may be inferred from the question which met the Pharisees and Sadducees, that John insisted much on the need for the sincerity of motive and purity of intention, and believed that neither were to be found in the hearts of the higher classes who came out to his baptism. (Matt. iii.)^v This was another great principle of the Gospel which he unfolded, that "God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit and in truth," and that it is not enough to come to ordinances and outward signs, however necessary in themselves they may be, without a heart prepared to receive the good they bear, because conscious of its own wants, and seeking strength in them as the gifts of God.

Close upon this followed the Baptist's denunciation of all false grounds of trust, based upon the prophetic insight which had been given him into the great mystery of the catholic nature of God's salvation, and the future participation of the Gentiles in the privileges of the Jews (Matt. iii. 9; Luke iii. 5, 6).^w This to the nation at large was beyond everything a mystery, and though taught by the Baptist and by Christ (John x. 16), and fully explained by the apostles, has remained unrevealed to Jewish eyes until the present hour; and, perhaps, for this reason John did not dwell more upon it than was necessary to add clearness to his idea of the kingdom, and break down the national pride, by which its realization was so greatly hindered.

It will thus be seen that while John combatted the prevailing errors, from the standing-ground of the old Jewish ideas and beliefs arising from the Old Testament, many of the weapons which he employed were drawn from the new revelation of which

* "Johannes aliquid videtur dixisse novi, quod in Decalogo non omnino esset expressum, ut qui duas haberet tunicas, ei qui nullam habuit daret alteram."—Maldonatus, *Comm.*, luc. iii.

^v "Supponit futuram esse iram, esse rationem fugiendi in proximo, ab eâ alienos esse Phariseos et Sadduceos."—Bengel *in loco*.

^w It is *the mystery* of the Gospel of which the apostles speak so frequently in the epistles; understanding by mystery, one of God's purposes once concealed and now revealed. It is worth remarking that it is only in St. Luke (the character of whose gospel is "*universality*") that we find the full quotation, "All flesh shall see the salvation of God."

he was the forerunner. For example, he came in the garb and demeanour of a prophet of the former times, and baptized with a baptism probably familiar to the Jews: the subjects of his preaching were not new—a kingdom foretold in the Scriptures, and a personal King and Saviour; but henceforth he drew his inspiration from the Spirit of the Gospel. He strove to dislodge the Jews from the strongholds of their hypocrisy and pride, by warnings that God would choose others if they were unmindful of their duty; that he cared little for a worship of the body if their will and hearts were not given to him; that he looked for the fruit of their repentance in love and charity to others; and then he applied all this to prove that the kingdom would be spiritual, and not temporal only—one of reality, and not of show.

IV. *The close and results of John's Ministry.*

But even John, with this almost Christian insight into the true position of our Lord, seems to have been vexed with some lingering prejudices arising from his Jewish origin. While in health and at liberty he spoke out boldly of Christ, and pointed to him as the only king whom the people could ever look for; but when Herod had laid hands upon him and imprisoned him, it is possible that for an instant his faith gave way; he may have thought that, like himself, Christ was but a forerunner; so that the doubts and hopes of his early training were summed up in the desponding question, "Art thou he that should come, or do we look for another?"*

There is nothing improbable in attributing this momentary unbelief to John. No doubt he was a man of the strongest faith, and gifted with a very clear perception of the Messiah's work; but these are not inconsistent with occasional perplexity and doubt. Those who say so can have very little real understanding of the weakness of man, and his inability to hold fast at all times alike, and under varying circumstances, the divine truths which he has really and fully made his own. In spite of the fullest communication of divine truth and unction, the prophets of old let go too often the sense of God's nearness and

* This appears the most probable among the various explanations given of John's question. It is held by Tertullian, Olshausen, Neander, Lightfoot, and others. Chrysostom and many others imagine that it was asked for the benefit of John's disciples. This view obtains among Roman Catholic Commentators; *vide* Maldonatus *in loco*; and has been warmly supported by Stier:—*The Words of Jesus*; Clark's Edition, vol. ii.

Neander well remarks that he did not doubt of Christ's mission, but only of its nature; for he was prepared to rest satisfied with his answer.—*Life of Christ*.

protection, and fell into unfaithfulness, which drew on them rebuke and punishment.^y It could not be otherwise; for the effect of the indwelling of the Holy Ghost was not to raise them above all the weakness to which humanity is subject, but to give them greater strength than their fellows, for their struggles with themselves and the world, and so to make them infinitely more fitted for the difficulties of their work than if they had gone forth to it with no more than natural strength and natural consolations. If we add to this the well-known fluctuations of the faith of the Christians of to-day, and remember that the "least" of these is nevertheless "greater" in his opportunities and advantages than "John," we shall no longer hesitate to interpret this question by the light of our Lord's answer as one of doubt which needed to be rebuked.^z

The rebuke was of that negative kind which spoke of compassion for John's weakness. Christ gave him no explicit answer, but left the simple recital of his wondrous works to kindle up his servant's faith, which he knew had wavered only for a moment, with a gentle warning that his disbelief was causing him to lose a blessing.^a

With this, all notice of John's life ends, and his death followed in a short time. It seems that when Herod had imprisoned him on account of his plain-spoken rebuke of his adultery and incest, he would have carried his violence no farther, because of the anger of the people: and we may infer that John was not harshly treated from the continuance of his intercourse with his disciples. But though the king "heard him gladly, and did many things because of him," he kept Herodias in spite of his remonstrance, and her influence outweighed all fear. The convenient day soon came, and after a short ministry of a year, the Baptist fell—a martyr to the union of the tyranny and vice which he had so constantly opposed, foreshadowing the fate of him for whom his death made way^b (Matt. xiv. 5; Mark vi. 20).

^y *E. g.*, Elijah, Jonah.

^z Cf. Neander's *Life of Christ*.

^a In case his rebuke should lessen John's influence, our Lord immediately proceeds to place him in the high place he deserved (Matt. xi. 15).

^b Josephus assigns a political cause for his death, "δέσας τὸ ἐπὶ τοσόνδε πιθανὸν αὐτοῦ τοῖς ἀνθρώποις μὴ ἐπὶ ἀποστάσει τινὶ φέροι;" probably giving the ostensible reason, as no doubt Herod would fear to give the real reason for the murder, from the weakness of his character.

He also speaks highly of John's moral character and efforts for the good of the nation, drawing his information from Banus, John's instructor.—Kitto, Neander.

There are varying accounts of the length of John's ministry; some suppose that he commenced three years and a half before Christ, others allow only a six months' interval; probably the latter date is the most correct.

"His grave is still pointed out at Sebastieh as that of the 'Prophet John, Son of Zecharias,' revered alike by Christian and Mussulman."—Stanley's *Palestine*, p. 291.

If we look for the results of the Baptist's labours, we shall find little to satisfy our curiosity. The sudden and strange appearance of one claiming to be in the closest connexion with the Messiah was too remarkable a fact to pass unnoticed in the peculiar condition of the times. By its influence on the minds of the people it gained the forced attention of the higher classes; and then the presence of the Pharisees and Sadducees in turn made far greater to the people the attraction of John's preaching. It was useless to deny the reality of his work, when men of all characters and every standing, from scribes of the law to soldiers and tax-gatherers, stood side by side to listen to the unsparing censures of their uncharitableness and sin which fell upon all alike. And as the well-nigh forgotten prophecies of the Old Testament crowded back to their memories, clothed with a fresh force and meaning by the new prophet's words, they brought with them the half belief that the Messiah had already come, and was himself preaching and baptizing (Luke iii. 15).

The stir and tumult must have reached their height when the Sanhedrim was moved to demand from John an explanation of his position. He answered them plainly, but not fully; for probably he was aware that their opinions would be influenced more by the rank and authority he might claim than by the internal evidence of his teaching. There is nothing more remarkable about John than his humility and true estimate of himself: he felt that his work was to change rather than to construct, and that he was sent to lay down principles for others rather than to carry them out himself, and he implied this in his answer. While denying his right to any of the titles which they had fastened on him, he still insisted that his mission was foretold in the Scriptures; and, avoiding any explanation of his own which might have been open to misconstruction, he defined it in the language of Isaiah,^c as the "voice" of preparation before the Lord, breaking down all class distinctions and other obstacles, "to make ready all flesh for his salvation."^d This plain though cautious denial, while it overthrew their misplaced hopes, probably lessened his own influence; and although the people

^c There may be a deeper significance than is generally thought in the contrasted *φωνή* and *λογός*; as in the following old hymn:—

"Vox clamentis in deserto,
Vox verbi prænuntia."

Adam St. Victor, in Trench.

^d "Class distinctions." The passage from Isaiah will very well bear this meaning. Most of the fathers (as quoted in *Catena Aurea*) seem to have referred it to the equalization of all men as sinners before God.

retained their respect for him as a messenger of God, they do not seem to have profited much, as a nation, by his ministry.*

No doubt the greater number of those who sought him in the wilderness left him in a little while in disappointment or disgust; but many, as we have seen, listened to him trustingly with a jealousy for his honour, and an earnest desire for truth and knowledge: and during his life some of these joined themselves to Christ, but others remained with him until his death; and then, after they had testified their love by caring for his burial, they "went and told Jesus." They may have been the bearers of his latest message to their Master, and were now willing to receive him "without offence" (Mark vi. 25; John i. 36).

Many again of his hearers were contented with the knowledge of Christ which they had gained from his teaching, and did not care to seek for a fuller gospel; others, in the natural order of things, had no opportunities of learning more. And out of these two classes (and chiefly from the latter) sprung the sect mentioned in the Acts as disciples who knew "John's baptism only."† From their belief in the reality of Christ's person they ranked themselves as Christians, but their Christianity went no further, and they knew nothing of the gift of the Spirit. Nevertheless they were teachable and of strong faith, so that when St. Paul had simply explained to them, that the Jesus whom he was preaching was the same with the "one to come" whom John looked for, they gladly threw up their separate position and entered into Christian fellowship.‡

We have now glanced rapidly at John from some of the many points of view he offers—in his connexion with the men of his time, and in his relation to Christ—in his high office and true conception of his place—in the nature and result of his labours.‡ His knowledge was so full and his development of it so clear and bold, that the great difficulty has been to keep from

* The small amount of *lasting* success which followed the Baptist's ministry is very striking when contrasted with the fruits of apostolic labour. Though numbers were baptized by him, but few seem to have been converted. Under the dispensation of the Spirit it was not so. We read that in one day "three thousand souls" passed into the kingdom of Christ through the gate of Christian baptism.

† The disciples of John appear to have been grieved to see men flocking to the new teacher for baptism. They were desirous to uphold the cause of their master against that of Christ—to found a sect for themselves; but they little knew of what spirit John was.

‡ *Μαθηται*, Acts xix. 1. Neander says this can only be understood of Christians, if used without any qualification.

‡ John's disciples, as a sect, are said to exist to-day with a Gnostic tendency.—Conybeare and Howson, vol. ii.; Kitto's *Bib. Encyclop.*, art. John.

‡ In what sense did John deny that he was Elias? evidently in the literal sense which the question meant; for we know from our Lord's authority that *in some sense*

reading him in too Christian a light; to avoid seeing more in his words than he intended by them; and thus looking at him as a preacher of the gospel rather than as a witness to Christ of the elder dispensation. Neander remarks how apt we are to fall into this error, and make John "nearer to Christianity than he really was." But the opposite tendency must be avoided also, for he must not be robbed of the glory rightfully his own. He saw and that very much more clearly than any had done before, the aim of the new kingdom and the office of its King. He brought in quite new modes of thought and language among the Jews; forcing them to connect fresh ideas with old things, to give up much of that which had hitherto been thought most true, and believe much very foreign to their previous habits and beliefs. He gave new life and meaning to their hackneyed interpretations of Scripture, and unfolded much of its hidden richness which they had missed or slighted; and in all this he was striving to disentangle them from the inveterate prejudice and cherished falsehoods, which choked up every inlet to the nobler and better centre of their being—the belief in the one Lord God, so that he might deliver over the nation into the hand of their king with hearts more hopeful and impressible for the working of his mighty will.

This is no easy task at any time, or in any measure; but for a man to seek to break up ground which has been running to waste for ages, and fit it for a seed almost entirely new; to force the stagnating depths of opinions and ideas to flow in a strange channel; and above all to give weight to his words while insisting on the subordinate character of his own position, and his speedy and certain decrease before one greater than himself, is hopeless if he have no more than human strength; and the fact that in this the Baptist succeeded largely, is in itself no doubtful proof that he was indeed a "prophet of the highest."

C. H. W.

he was *Elias* (Matt. xvii.), and we are not precluded by Christ's answer from believing that the words of Malachi shall yet have a fuller accomplishment before the final coming of the "great day of the Lord;" indeed, the phrases which Christ uses, appear to at least *hint* this. In Matt. xvii. 11, he tells his disciples that Elias, "*ἀποκαταστήσει πάντα*," while telling them that he had *already come*. Words which may very fairly be taken to imply another and a more successful advent of Elijah. Similarly in Matt. xi. 14. Alford says well that the expression *ὁ μέλλων ἔρχεσθαι* does not = *ὃς ἐμελλεν ἔρχεσθαι* (as Bengel thought), but refers to that advent still future. We know that the predictions of our Lord's coming have as yet received only a partial fulfilment, and there is every reason to believe that this holds good of those relating to his forerunner.

j This must not be understood to imply assent to Neander's statement, that the evangelists, writing as Christians, put words and doctrines into John's mouth which he never uttered, because they understood better than he did his position.—Neander's *Life of Christ*, p. 47.

EGYPTIAN DYNASTIES.—No. III.^a

FROM whatever cause it proceeded, it is admitted by all writers on Egyptian History, that its traditions extend back into a remoteness far greater than belongs to them, and give an antiquity to the country which is altogether spurious and impossible. Rivalry with the pretensions of neighbouring kingdoms might have given rise to this, from ambition in its chroniclers not to be outdone in length of ancestry; or it might have originated in mistaken interpretations of its sacred registers, the repositories of its public acts and recorded solemnities, and the periods by which they were commemorated. For either of these, the methods of computation used by the priests, which aimed at bringing all their systems of chronology within the limits of certain cycles varying according to the nature of their sacred institutes, would have afforded ready facilities. For as these were made up of their sacerdotal courses, or changes of service, or from the order of their public assemblies or *πανηγύρεις*, which Herodotus says were not held once in a year only, but frequently; in fact, by all the various ways which give occasion to a registration of recurring periods in a State or its religions; it needed only to assign untrue values to those registers, to raise their records to much more extensive periods than properly belonged to them. When we read from Syncellus therefore, that the thirty dynasties of their kings extended over a period of 36,525 years, we cannot doubt that some mystical cycle or series of revolutions is brought to bear upon the true period, to give it that vast extension; for that number is the very same as the priesthood ascribed to the books of their "Thrice Great Hermes;" and it is in its natural phase the exact number of days in a hundred years. If then there existed any sacerdotal course whose periods were constituted of twelve days, so as to make about thirty courses in a year, and that large cycle was formed out of a series of such periods, the 36,525 courses would resolve themselves into an interval of about 1200 years; and we shall see whether such a course of reckoning may not be taken as probable in the concluding pages of this paper.

It is certain that this view of the subject was taken by the Greek writers. The account given by Diodorus of the age of Helios, the Heliun of Sanchoniathon, is; "that there were about 23,000 years from his reign down to the time of Alexander the

^a Continued from July, 1857.

Great, and that some of the gods of that period reigned for above 1200 years ;” but, adds the historian, “ many people, being sceptical as to this great antiquity, conjectured from the sun’s revolution being not well understood, that they reckoned their time by the revolutions of the moon ; so that their years, ‘ *Ἑτεα*,’ being of thirty days’ extension only, it was not impossible that some of their reigns might have exceeded 1200 of such periods, equivalent to a hundred solar years.” “ A similar solution,” continues Diodorus, “ might be given of those reigns which were reckoned of 300 years’ duration, by counting by the old periodic seasons of ‘ spring,’ ‘ summer,’ and ‘ winter,’ which were also called ‘ *years*,’ and were used in their reckonings, a custom which extended itself even to some of the Greek families.”^b

Among the Jews the sacred registers of their monthly feasts, if not controverted by other public chronicles, might have been adduced as a testimony of a similar antiquity. Reckonings by their priestly Courses, which would have been of the same kind, are in fact resorted to by modern chronologists, as affording the truest standard of dates to their history. Both Scaliger and Petavius have used the method of computing the true date of the Baptist’s nativity from these sacerdotal courses. For there were twenty-four courses of seven days in every rotation of the Jewish priesthood, constituting a “ *cycle* ” of 168 days ; and of these Scaliger reckoned 349 revolutions in 160 years, between the institution of the Asmonean priesthood of the course of Abia, and the Sabbath of the 21st July, A.J.P. 4710, which he sets as the true birthday of John. How easy would it have been for an Egyptian antiquary to extend this long period in the annals of his country, by confounding these 349 sacerdotal rotations with the revolutions of the year, as they did the months and seasons ; and it cannot be doubted that all these exaggerated reckonings may be attributed to errors of this kind.

In our two former papers on this subject we have endeavoured to shew, that the accounts given by Sanchoniathon of the early generations of mankind concur with those which the Scriptures have assigned to the line of patriarchs, between Noah and Abraham. Both consist of ten generations, and the mythical attributes of the concluding series of the Syrian writer are plainly built upon the scriptural histories of the three sacred families, with whom God established his promises by oral communication. In this consummation, the patriarchal regime, which was that to which the Egyptian traditions refer as the reign of the gods, had its termination. Helion is referred to as of the tenth generation,

^b Diod., i., 26.

which was the same as Abraham's from a new Stirps in Shem ; and *Cronus*, whose mythos embraces in his own person events which befell all the branches of the Triphyllian family, is third in descent from Heliun, as Jacob was from Abraham. From this *Cronus* and his contemporaries Sanchoniathon dates the immediate descent and succession of those gods and priesthoods, which form all the early subjects of Egyptian and Greek tradition :—the *Cronus* of the African traditions ; the *Jupiter Belus*, venerated in Egypt and Assyria ; Apollo, Nereus, Sidon, Poseidon, Hercules, and the priesthoods of the Cabiri and Egyptian Thoth. By the marriage of one of his daughters with "*Sydyc the Just*," in whom is recognized the house and lineage of the Melchisedec of Scripture, came *Asclepius* or *Æsculapius*, called by Clemens Alexandrinus "*Memphites*," and the same as the Egyptian God ; and by his brother Atlas and his daughters the Titanides, his history is pieced on to the African families and the traditions affecting that regime ; out of whose central kingdoms both the Egyptian and Greek records aver, that the Osirian Gods and their descendant kings, as well as the Hesperian families of Western Europe, took their origin.

Looking at the extraordinary concatenation, which unites these notices with the sacred story on the one hand, and the concurrent traditions of Greece, Egypt, and the African kingdoms on the other, it does appear to us that there is an irrefragable testimony as to the origin of the Egyptian dynasties in these accounts, and the period when they took their commencement. We have shewn what that time was approximately in our former papers, and assumed a specific date hypothetically for the epoch of the kingly succession in "*Menes*," its first named sovereign of the thirty dynasties of Manetho. In the present Number, our object will be to shew that the numerous histories and computations derived from the Egyptian priests, and preserved by the Greek writers, may be very well reconciled to these former conclusions, by reducing them to such denominations as were probably their true ones ; and from one of these accounts we shall find the means of computing the exact epoch of this first king, as we have put it hypothetically in our former number, to be of the year B.C. 1668.

We are aware we have more to contend with in this undertaking and have had throughout, than the common *argumentum ad rationem*, in the prescriptive obscurity which all men determine shall belong to this era of the world's history. It is a land of shadows and dreams as Joseph found it, and so it must for ever remain ; since every one claims the privilege of indulging in a sort of dreamy reverie upon the obscurities of this early

period of civilization; the cradling times of the arts of life, and of those sacred rites which bind societies together in the bonds of kindred and religion: so that it cannot be questioned that the lifting up of that veil which the priestess of the waters of Sihor declared no man ever should lift up, if it could be effectively done, would be felt rather as the breach of a delightful spell than any great benefit to the world at large; or even to the privileged few, who conceive themselves to be peculiarly interested in such revelations. But the notion of this obscurity has been transferred from this book of mysteries to the sacred Scriptures, and its chronological pretensions set forward in opposition to that record; and it is for that cause we have taken the part of testing the conventional difficulties, which have been cast around the annals of this "land shadowed with wings," and its dependencies; and to shew that, as far as its chronology is concerned, they are more imaginary than real. The chronology of the Bible was determined by men of profound learning and sincerity, to whom all the pretensions of Egyptian antiquity were well known, and they were discarded by them as the triflings of a vain and unscrupulous people. It never could have happened that they were overlooked or forgotten; and it is at least due to those great pioneers of sacred chronology, to shew that the surmisings of an age not profound are not altogether to be depended upon. In our own view of the subject we think the old histories and traditions concur in a very sufficient development of the circumstances, and generally of the periods of the ancient kingdoms of the world; and in that conviction we have ventured to controvert some prevailing misconceptions on the subject, and to propose others more suitable.

The turning point in the whole of this question, we venture to suggest, rests upon the age of the Osirian gods. If we can determine that with certainty, then the accession of Menes, and the thirty dynasties which followed him, will find a reliable epoch for their commencement. And we feel convinced, if that point of enquiry be taken in hand by any person with a mind fairly bent on investigating the truth it cannot fail but that he will come to a conclusion, that that race of kings succeeded the age of Abraham and his two next generations by a very brief interval. For it is shewn, as certainly as any history can do so of that antiquity, that the antecedent generation of that race of kings, or gods by courtesy, were certainly the contemporaries of the Abrahamic family in the third descent from that patriarch; and if this cannot be controverted, as it cannot be without rejecting the very same authorities upon which every other conclusion is founded by writers who treat of that age and history

it seems that there is hardly room for question on the subject. We have given various reasons for this conclusion in our former papers, which it is only needful here to refer to. They are principally drawn from the history of Manetho, and the plain recognition by that writer of the system of ancient chronology, drawn up by Sanchoniathon. But there is one notice of this author omitted in our former dissertations, which appears to be deserving of particular observation, and to which we must now advert.

The account given by Manetho of the departure of the Israelites from Egypt is, that they were a people of lepers who were expelled by a king Amenophis, at a period which coincides with the view we have taken of it. But this historian adds, "that the priest who ordained the policy and laws of the expelled people was by birth of *Heliopolis*, the city of '*On*;' that his name was *Osorsiph*, from *Osiris* who was the God of *Heliopolis*; and that when he was gone over to these people, his name was changed to Moses."^c Whether this is a confused account of the history of Joseph with that of the Exodus, and a conversion of the name of Joseph into *Osorsiph*, to which it bears an undoubted analogy, we cannot divine; but it is quite evident, that the traditions of the time of Manetho ascribed the priesthood of "*On*," with which the younger son of Israel was associated, to an *Osirian Institution*. The priest's daughter whom Joseph married was therefore the daughter of a priest of Osiris; and that worship existed in its pristine state, in connexion with the families of Israel down to the time of the Exodus and the reign of "*Amenophis*," the last king of the eighteenth dynasty; under whom we have found that event occurred, which brought the house of Horus and the line of kings from him, in that table, to their end.^d

Then, if we refer to the genealogies of these gods, which are given both by Sanchoniathon and Manetho, we shall find that they were of a date which must have had its commencement in that very age when the holy patriarchs were existing: and we must again, at the risk of the tautology, exhibit this succession in a tabular form, as the connexion it evinces is of material importance. We will only here stop to point out, that in the supplementary tables of the demigods, beginning with Horus, the contemporary of Menes, but of a generation earlier, the

^c See Whiston's *Josephus against Apion*, p. 310.

^d We must refer the reader for this table to our last article on this subject, in the July number of the last year. And here we must take the opportunity of noticing an erratum in the heading of the table of "*Dynasties*," at the end of that paper: as the *Dynasties of Sanchoniathon*, instead of the *Dynasties of Manetho*.

years amount altogether to 214, being the exact period between the birth of Manasseh and the date of the Exodus. Thus the tables are :—

FROM HEBREW SCRIPTURE.	FROM THE SYRIAN SANCHONIATHON.	FROM THE EGYPTIAN MANETHO.
		GODS.
Abraham.	Heliun, a stranger at Biblos.	1. Vulcan.
Isaac.	Sydyc.	2. Helios, son of Vulcan .. yrs. 86
Jacob.	Thoth, Egyptian Hermes.	3. Agathodæmon 56
—	Cronus.	4. Crónus 41
Joseph.	Dios, called by the African traditions Osiris, of the Dog Star, and Arabian Pillar.	5. Osiris and Isis 35
Manasseh, son of Joseph.		6. Omitted, but plainly the second Osiris.
	FROM MANETHO.	7. Typhon, brother of the second Osiris & Horus 29
	Menes, successor to the reign of the Osiridæ.	DEMIGODS.
		8. Orus, contemporary of Menes, and eight successors, shewn below.

CORRELATIVE TABLES OF DEMIGODS AND KINGS.

Demigods from Manetho's History, succeeding the Osirian gods.	years.	Kings after Horus, from Manetho's eighteenth dynasty, succeeding the Osirian gods.
8. Horus	25	8. Horus.
9. Ares	23	9. Achencheres.
10. Anubis.....	17	10. Athoris.
11. Hercules	15	11. Chenchares.
12. Apollo.....	25	12. Acherres.
13. Ammon	30	13. Cherres.
14. Tithoes	27	14. Armes.
15. Sosus	32	15. Armesses.
16. Zeus	20	16. Ammenophis.

The concurrence of these genealogies is very exact, and there is, moreover, a striking coincidence in the number of the demi-gods from Orus, with the kings of the eighteenth dynasty from the same person, according to the version of Eusebius, as given

above, which seems to exemplify a tradition preserved by Herodotus, that at one time the kings and priests ruled in the same numerical succession; and that Horus was reckoned both as a king who first reigned after the gods, and yet retained his rank as a god. For these tables of Manetho shew him in both capacities, and the succession equal in both lines also, as the tables evince.

If our inference be well made, those are the coincident series of priests or demigods with their kings, who ruled between the end of the Osirian gods and the Exodus; in which event both races terminated, and the whole system came to an end. And if it puts the "*Zeus*," as the contemporary hierarch of that dynasty with the king who was lost in the Red Sea, according to Manetho's version and our own, we shall not have occasion for any great surprise on that ground, if we recollect that the Jewish lawgiver was traditionally figured with the same marks of power as the Ammonite Jupiter; and that from the Midianite hierarchy, the Dioscuri or priesthood of the Cretan lawgiver, or Jupiter of that island, certainly took their origin.

The periods assigned to these reigns concur fully then with the requisites of our theory, that they were contemporaneous with the later branches of the families of Abraham. For the interval between the end of the reigns of these demigods and the reign of Heliun amounts, as the figures will shew to 461 years; which, if the series terminated at the period of the exodus, and in the year B.C. 1491, will carry back the date of that epoch to the year B.C. 1952. That will be the beginning of the reign of Heliun, the contemporary and mythical shadow of the Hebrew patriarch—we ask: do the dates coincide?

Now it was, according to the Scripture chronology, in the year B.C. 1955, three years before the epoch of that mythical dynasty, that "*Serug*" the grandfather of Terah died, his son Nahor having died fifty-two years before. Serug was the seventh in descent from Shem, corresponding with the Hephæstus or Vulcan, who is the seventh mythical generation of Sanchoniathon. The *Vulcan* of Manetho and *Heliun* of Sanchoniathon are therefore clearly of the same date, and represent the same dynastic sovereignty—and that dynasty ceased to be reckoned in the descending genealogies of human power, in the year B.C. 1952; being the three years after Serug's death, above referred to. The change of dispensation, therefore, shewn in both these Phœnician and Egyptian records, is in exact keeping with the changes recorded by the Scriptures; and the story is perfectly clear and certain. On the death of *Serug*, who was the last of that patriarchal rule which the Egyptian chronicles designate as one

reign, under *Vulcan* the God of Fire, who reigned in the land of "*Ur*," or "*the Land of Fire*;" from whence, perhaps, the mythos was derived; his grandson *Terah*, finding the family broken up—for the tradition says, that his own son *Haran* was taken from him as a punishment by God for his idolatry; and urged as it is also said by the solicitations of *Abraham*, because of the prevalent idolatry of the people of their own country—betook himself to *Haran* with his descendants *Abram* and *Lot*, and led the Father of the Faithful by that order of events, towards his appointed land. In the next journeying of *Abraham* towards *Damascus*, the Syrian traditions meet him at *Byblos*, and trace the succeeding events, in conjunction with his descendants, into the Egyptian and Greek traditions. There are three years therefore in this reckoning, between the death of *Serug* and the forsaking of the land of their nativity by his descendants; which appears to be such an interval only as might precede such movement, and afford the necessary preparations for a final abandonment of their old associations.

In computing the age of the *Osiridæ* from these Tables, and reckoning the years upwards from the year B.C. 1491, the reign of *Cronus* will appear to have had its commencement about the year B.C. 1810; and his reign being of forty years' duration, the succession of the first *Osiris* must be dated B.C. 1769. Without trusting too much to these figures, we may fairly ascribe a proximate truth to them: and they shew an interval of 100 years therefore, between that accession and the accession of *Menes*, as by our hypothesis, in the year B.C. 1668:—that would therefore be the period of the reigns of the two *Osiridæ*, with the fourteen years ascribed to the reign of *Horus* before the accession of *Menes*; and it appears an interval very suitable to such a course of succession.

This computation shews the beginning of these *Osirian* gods to coincide with the twenty-fifth year before the birth of *Joseph*, who was born B.C. 1745 according to the Scripture chronology. About that period then, the city of *BUBASTUS* was built, as an endowment or appanage of the Arabian or first *Isis*:—the district was plainly a province of the Arabian or Ethiopian kingdom, and the "*Fountain Worship*" established at "*On*" it cannot be doubted, was brought into its location there by the same course of events. It would not be difficult to shew that that worship proceeded from Arabia, and had an early settlement at the sources of the Nile, where there are still unmistakeable relics of its existence; and from thence it may be concluded it was conveyed to the shores of the Delta in Lower Egypt, with the access of the new rising power of the *Osirian*

Conquerors. It seems as plain as possible that this city of BUBASTUS must have been a mart for merchandize at the confluence of the two seas, the Red Sea and the Mediterranean, then probably in communication with each other; either by an absolute conjunction of their waters or by some facile communication through the marshy lands that lay between them;—and the sacerdotal settlement at “*On*,” which was not a name, but an appellative only, denoting simply “A FOUNTAIN,” was the mere accompaniment of that secular settlement in its vicinity.

The reign of the first *Osiris* it is said extended over thirty-five years, and so would have terminated in the year B.C. 1734: and JOSEPH having come into Egypt, B.C. 1729, that event would have taken place in the fifth year of the reign of the *second Osiris*, and sixty-one years before the accession of *Menes*; or forty-seven before that of *Horus* in the double capacity of king and demigod, or hierarch as we have shewn. Then again, *Horus* reigned down to the year B.C. 1645, as the tables shew; and *Menes* down to the year B.C. 1607; and these were contemporaries and coadjutors of that dynasty of kings, by whom Joseph had been cherished and exalted. So that we may, without any great improbability, regard the death of the latter king as that to which the Scripture refers, when it states that after Joseph’s death there arose up a king that knew not Joseph, and reduced the people of Israel to a state of servitude. The account evidently infers that this amity towards the son of Jacob was a personal one towards Joseph himself, the good of which was lost to the people by the accession of a new king, and not by a change of dynasty. The promise he gave his people on Jacob’s death, that he would be a father to them, was fulfilled during his life by the exaltation of his character and the influence he bore, but failed when he and his patron king was no longer present to aid and protect them. The position of the people in their state of bondage is one of great anomaly, and was probably confined to the lower classes, who were sent as Manetho says, to the quarries to labour in a degraded condition. For it is evident the house of Amram, and some other families, particularly those of the houses of Judah and Ephraim, retained a dignified and exalted position in Egypt to the last hour of their abode there, and were fitted to enter upon the offices assigned to them in the Exodus, when that event occurred, with proper authority and estimation in the eyes of the people. In fact, the condition of the regnant dynasty of that country, according to the Manethan tables as we have interpreted them, is completely answerable to all the requisitions of the sacred history at that early period.

In looking at the collateral tables, drawn out in a preceding page in this view of the matter, it will be impossible not to be struck with the resemblance that is apparent in the contemporary names which close those successions. Whether any real affinity could have existed between the names of Menes and Manasseh, may perhaps not very easily be decided: but the phonetic resemblance of the Egyptian name to that of the Hebrew cannot we suppose be questioned. The concurrence of the sacred and profane characters of old tradition and history in the Phœnician story, leads to a not altogether gratuitous supposition, that an association of the two families may have given rise to that similitude, seeing that the owners of these names were certainly contemporaries: and we may be led by that conclusion to infer also, that the marriage of Joseph with the priest's daughter of "*the Fountain*," was accompanied by an establishment of himself and some branch of his family in his new country, in a superior caste of the sacerdotal order; or in some other way, of which the authority continued in his family, probably during all the period of his people's abode in the land of their bondage. Upon this point our readers will form their own judgment. The concurrence of the generations, and the affinity of the names appear to sanction such a hypothesis; and, for ourselves, we are disposed to regard the matter in that way. As the point is new however we may be permitted to direct attention to a few peculiarities in the nature of that elevation, which the lost son of Jacob, "*he who was separated from his brethren*," was admitted to in the Gentile kingdom. They are of a character which appears peculiarly suitable to any purpose, in which himself and his family might be designed to become instrumental in conveying some of the benefits of the Abrahamic blessing to the outer nations of that age. We have, in our former number, referred to such a dispensation as being probably manifested in the distribution of the Keturene families of the house of Abraham, by their distribution as kings and priests over the early continents of Africa and Europe: from one of which we have seen the royal scions of the Osirian stock were transferred into their new seat of dominion in the upper parts of Egypt and Nubia. The same order of things, but by another stage in the progress, may then possibly be seen in the establishment of this other sacred hybrid, by the ingraft of the house of *Joseph*, upon the fountain worship of the lower Nile; between the seas and in ordained contiguity to the abodes of both the two people. It was indeed Menes, we are told, who taught the Egyptians the sacred rites of sacrifice and the proper mode of shewing worship to the gods; and although

if we could suppose that those early institutes were at all such as were charged against the Egyptian religion of a later date, reason would be for at once rejecting all notions of such an association; yet it is against all experience to believe that the superstitions of the Isidian religion were of that generation, not of an age posterior to the origin of its institution. The veil which clothed its later mysteries was surely woven at a later period than the events which gave origination to the religion itself; for we might with equal justice ascribe the corruptions of the Roman Church to the preaching of St. Paul in his own hired house at Rome, as the abomination of the later Egyptians to the priesthood which gave birth to their religion.

Putting aside, therefore, an objection which might deter us from an impartial view of the subject, it cannot be denied that the association of Joseph with a priesthood, nearly as great as, if not paramount to, the Egyptian sovereign himself, appears as a very suitable dispensation for conveying some portion of the new light, which was shed upon his own favoured family, to the community he was then associated with; and that the fact was, as Joseph declared of it to his brethren, "That it was not they who had sent him into Egypt, but God: that he might be *a father* to Pharaoh, and *lord of all* his house, and a *ruler* throughout all the land of Egypt." (Gen. xlv. 8). We must confess this marriage of "*Joseph*, with the priest's daughter," seeing its decidedly providential character, has always appeared to us a great marvel, and a mystery like that which St. Paul admires so much in the admission of the Gentiles to the Jewish covenant, by the breaking down of "the wall of partition" which had before shut them out; only here the wall is not broken down, but its boundary overtopped by a fruit-bearing branch of the vine within it. The tradition of that marriage was probably preserved in the fabled one of "*Ephesus*" and "*Memphis*," among the Asiatic Greeks; from which alliance arose the whole house of those sacred Belidæ, whose branches were transferred to Assyria and Asia Minor; where their names were commemorated in the countries they settled or subdued—Phœnice, in Phœnicia; Cilix, in Cilicia; and Europa, in the coasts of Thessaly and Greece. It is certain the scions of that family came from *Ægypt*; and not less certain that all their territories had some recognized association with the holy seed, and participated in its destinies; for the whole of those regions were brought within the pale of the prophetic anathemas of the prophets of Israel; which could not have been, except they were in some way also participitants in the blessing of that dispensation.

It seems evident then, there was a purpose in Joseph's establishment in Egypt, of extending the Abrahamic blessing, either in its secular or sacerdotal kind, into that community and its descendant colonies. The very terms of the blessing pronounced by Jacob upon that favourite son, shew that some such purpose was recognized by the aged patriarch himself; for what else could be intended by the expression, "that Joseph was a fruitful bough by a well" (the fountain of "On"), "whose branches should run over a wall?" (Gen. xlix. 22.) Or what, by the distinction Jacob made between the two eldest sons, and whatever other family Joseph might have after those? "Thy two sons Ephraim and Manasseh, which were born unto thee before I came into Egypt, shall be mine; as Reuben and Simeon, they shall be mine; and thy issue which thou begetteth after them shall be thine" (Gen. xlviii. 6). Though Joseph and his posterity still ranked, therefore, with the sacred households, it is as clear as can be that there was a purpose of temporary separation, by which the community of the Gentile kingdoms might be benefitted; as by the fruit of a bough that had overgrown its wall, and offered its treasures to the wayfarer on the other side of the precinct.

It is still open to us, however, to confine the subject to a purely mythical tradition, even if we should conclude that the name of Menes was borrowed from the son of Joseph, as that of a first sovereign in the new order of dynasties that was about to arise. For Menes bears in his name the nature of his traditional sovereignty, as the first "man king;" in contradistinction to the "God kings," who had preceded his reign. According to Rosellini, the word "Menes" signifies "men," as the *genus humanum*; and the appellative may be taken therefore in a mythical or metaphysical sense, if we are disposed so to regard it.

The whole circumstances of this period, whether viewed by the light of sacred history or the traditions of the outlying nations, seem to indicate a new epoch in the events of the world. The Egypt itself of history was probably only then rising above the waters of its first state, of which Herodotus says, its lower district was a sea like the Red Sea. Of that new country, the new powers which we trace in their settlements both at its south and north extremities, were then only leading its people into their abode. The Egypt of the Nile was certainly then only in its infancy and the priest of "On" a foreign priesthood, brought into its place at Heliopolis by the same course of events as led to the building of "Bubastus" by the Arabian Osiris, as the appanage of his queen.

Neither Thebes nor Memphis could have existed at that early period. The town of "*This*," in Upper Egypt, on the Libyan side of the river, was that which was built by the elder Osiris, and named after his wife, the "*This*" or "*Thisbe*" of the old Cushite houses, and was probably the first city built in that district. And over the Thinitic home, of which it was the metropolis, Menes became the first king, after the rule of the Osirian gods had come to its end. On the failure of the line of Horus, whose rule was paramount and his seat of power probably at Bubastus or in that vicinity if not at Pelusium, the supremacy over the *five kingdoms* fell into that family, and continued in some of its branches down to the extinction of that race of Pharaohs, by the usurpation of Amosis and the subjugation of the country to the Persians. Where the old kings of Egypt of the time of Abraham held their dominion will never be determined; but it was probably in the same place where the supreme power was located at the time of Joseph's visit to Egypt and afterwards till the Exodus; and in our judgment that was in the vicinity of the *Pelusiatic branch of the Nile*; the land of *Zoar*, where the miracles were wrought by Moses, and the vicinity of the "*Cassian Mount*." And of that old dominion, the countries must have extended to the "*Rhinocorura*" or "*River of Egypt*," which divided its territory, afterwards held by the Amalekites, from *Gerah* and the *Holy Land*. It was then by the coming of the new power of the Osirian kings, that the seats of the Egyptian people and the abodes of civilization were changed from their vicinity to the Amalekite and Ammorite people, a race of predatory warriors, to the banks of the Nile; which was thus settled upon both from the south and north by the new people.

The more one looks into the traditions on this subject, the more may we become convinced that this was the course of settlement on that river. When Bubastus was built, the Delta could not have been fully established above the sea, and that city would have stood on the verge of open waters, as Rotterdam does upon those at the mouths of the Scheldt and Meuse; and then it served as a sea mart for the rich spiceries of southern Arabia and India, in their transit to the new rising communities of the Mediterranean; no bad endowment for an eastern empress. A tradition of these open waters at the mouth of the Nile, was evidently in the popular keeping down to as low a period as Homer wrote his *Odyssey*; for there we find the poet speaking of a day's sail over them from the Pharos at the north-western point of the Delta to the *City of Proteus*, which we deem could be no other than "*Bubastus*," on their south-

eastern border. "This was one day's sail," says the poet, "in a ship with a fair wind," the distance in a straight line being about ninety miles, (*Odyssey*, b. iv.). The region which lies between Pelusium and Gaza, the Nile and the Rhinocosura, was, without doubt in that early period in a state of high fertility; proceeding from a different elevation of the bordering sea, whose subsidence from a higher level is evidenced along the whole of that coast, which bounds the eastern extremity of the Mediterranean. The description of the Nysæan Mountain, from the Orphæan hymn, if belonging to the Cassian Mount, fully maintains this; as do the half-fossilized trees in the deserts below Cairo in a great degree also confirm it, by shewing the existence of former forests in that district:—

“ Εἰ δέ τις Νύση, ὑπατον ὄρος, ἀνθέων,
Τηλὴ Φοινίκης, σχεδὸν Αἰγύπτιοιο ρόων.”—*Diod.*, i. 15.

“*The lofty mountain clothed with verdure and vegetation, remote from Phœnicia, and almost touching the streams of Egypt;*” can hardly belong to any other locality than this very spot of the *Cassian Mount*, so celebrated in ancient tradition. The later existence of the dangerous marshes and concealed bogs in that same vicinity which are now entirely gone, were doubtless the transition state of some former lake, which gradually subsided as the waters of the adjoining sea did so; and in effect, the whole question as to the locality of the “*Ancient Egypt and its River*,” finds an easy solution in the recognition of this early state of that region. Here, between the Delta and the *Rhinocorura*, were the first settlements of “*the Misraim*,” and from thence those families spread themselves into the African continent; while the younger branch of them, the Caphtorim, spread their white sails over the Southern Seas, and extended their traffic to Arabia and Ceylon, the island of Caphtor; and held their country mart perhaps at Pelusium, but certainly near the Cassian Mount, from whence they traded to the coasts and islands of that part of the Mediterranean. These peaceful settlements were disturbed by the wars of the Ammonite and Amalakite people, upon whose conquests the Osirian monarch established his power, and then brought his colonies into their northern seats. This, we think, may be collected from the Arabian histories of that period; and in these events the banks of the Nile received their Coptic and Ethiopian settlements.

There is one indication as to the state of things in Egypt at the time of Joseph's visit to it: which is, that the royal and priestly functions were separately administered and had their seats of power apart. This was purely a *Titanic Institute*. The

old Italic or Latian families were of that stock by descent from an African root, and there the king is shewn to have had his seat at Lavinium, and the priesthood at Albalonga, and the two together to have formed the one power in Church and State of the Latian kingdom.

When Pharaoh, therefore, exalted Joseph to the second "*chariot*" in the land; answering to the "*sedes curulis*" of the Tuscans, or the οὐρανὸς ἄλφρος, or "*chariot of the gods*" of a remoter institute; and gave him the daughter of the regnant Hierophant of the "*Fons Solis*," and put the sacred ornaments and royal insignia upon him; he enrolled "*the Hebrew Son*" among the princes of that land. And as this point is highly important, not perhaps so much as regards the fact as the bearing it has upon our argument, we may be excused for detaining our readers for a few lines for the purpose of referring them to the "*chronicles*" of the house of Jacob in its descendant lines, in proof of this hypothesis. For there in those chronicles, the chronicles of Holy Writ, they will find a son of that house "*Mered*" the grandson of Jacob and collateral therefore of Manasseh in his generation to have had several sons, of very Ethiopic designations, by "*Bithiah the daughter of Pharaoh*" (1 Chron. iv. 15). And yet more is it to the purpose that we find from the same authentic source, that the son of Joseph, Manasseh, took to himself the "*Aramite*" concubine to whom we have before referred (1 Chron. vii. 14): by which association we may trace at once the connexion between the new order of things in Egypt in the time of Menes, and the Syrian families of Sanchoniathon's Tables. For we have the high authority of Dr. Shaw for regarding the river "*Ker*" or "*Akher*," which waters that very region of Byblos, where the mythical family of the "*Hypsistus*" was first found in its journey towards the south—the shadowy type of Abraham and his family's transit through the same neighbourhood—as the very cradle of the Aramite family, and the same "*Ker*" as is referred to by the prophet Amos in his notice of that people. And if this be so, that land was also the birth-land of the children of Manasseh in Egypt, which were born from that concubine.

There are, however, other instances of a high and public caste in the condition of the Hebrew families during their Egyptian abode; for we read "of the sons of Ephraim being slain by the men of Gath, who were born in that land, because they went down and took away their cattle; and that Ephraim had a daughter, Sherah, who built the two cities of Bethhorn and Uzzah Sherah" (1 Chron. vii. 14, etc.); all indicative of a princely rank and Syrian association. So that it cannot be

doubted, that both the families of Joseph and Judah were intimately connected with the sovereignty of Egypt in one of its phases, either regally or sacerdotally. We may not forget, that the next king to Menes in the dynasties of Manetho is that Athothis who was the "Thoth" of the Phœnician historian, and so manifestly in a line somehow connected with that region: so that if it may at all be inferred that any descendants of the Hebrew Manasseh were found in this line of kings, it must be taken to be of that family which came by this Aramite concubine. Through that connexion, the association of the Syrian legends and customs with those of the early Egyptians, and our adaptation of the tombs found in the neighbourhood of "*Byblos*" to the registers of its ancient dynasties, appear to find a satisfactory elucidation. The existence of an old connexion, however, between this region and the Egypt of Osiris is supported by traditional customs, which prevailed to a late period at Byblos in honour of that god; whom the Byblians held was buried in their country and not in Egypt. Lucian says they were existing down to his time, and he witnessed them.^d

With these preliminary remarks we will proceed to our review of some of the Greek traditions respecting this country and its rulers; observing only that all these were derived from various priesthoods, and were all evidently framed to maintain the same mystery as to the true antiquity of its kings, as we find in Manetho himself. The most detailed of these second-hand records is that of Diodorus; and in one we find the same system adopted, as is used in the Manethan dynasties, of tacking chronicles together in an order of succession, which are manifestly concurrent accounts:—as if the chronicles of the kings of Israel should be appended to those of the kings of Judah as a continuous succession of kings, instead of in two collateral lines; a mistake which the dovetailing of the two histories in the books of the holy people has effectually guarded against.

A brief synopsis of Diodorus' account of this course of descents will enable the reader to judge of its character, and the way in which an untrue history has been framed out of the fragments of several true accounts, patched together and presented as a continuous history (b. i., 45, etc.). "After the gods," writes the Sicilian, "Menes was the first king of Egypt and taught his people how to worship the gods and perform sacrifices; and from that king followed *fifty-two descendants*" who reigned through "*a period of 1040 years.*" "But of these," adds the historian, "there was nothing worth recording." "After these kings,"

^d Lucian, *De Deâ Syriae*.

he continues, "Busiris became king and then eight of his sons in succession; the last of whom bore the same name as the first and built Diospolis or Thebes." Here he proceeds to give an account of some of the glories of that city in its palmiest state, and then of the tombs in its neighbourhood, as they were traditionally spoken of in the time of Ptolemy Lagos, to which we have referred in our last paper; but he subjoins a particular account of the tomb of *Osymandyas* (προσαγορευθέντος Ὀσυμανδύε, nicknamed *Osymandyas*), and the wonders attached to it, with a supplementary notice, that the Thebans accounted themselves the most ancient people and first philosophers among men, reckoned the year by its 365½ days and had a passing knowledge of eclipses.

From this digression of several pages and paragraphs, Diodorus returns to the regal succession: thus, "The *eighth descendant from this king*, who was called '*Uchoreus*,' built the city of *Memphis* and named it after his daughter, who was abducted and married by Nilus and became the mother of *Ægyptus*." This ravishment was effected by the lover in the form of a bull; but as *Nilus* appears in the royal descent of another line, we set the account down as an enlevement of a neighbouring king's daughter by him, under the disguise of one of the "*Tauri*," a race of pirates who infested the Egyptian seas and were finally eradicated by the great Sesostris in a later century. But Diodorus leaves us quite in the dark as to which king he refers to as the eighth antecedent to *Uchoreus*; whether to Busiris or Osymandyas, of both of whom he has given the accounts we have referred to.—"Twelve generations after *Uchoreus*," he continues, "the government was found in '*Mæris*,' who dug the lake that bore his name; and seven generations after him '*Sesostris*' became king, the most illustrious of this race of their sovereigns; who subdued the Ethiopians and all Asia and Scythia as far as the river *Tanais*; he was the great conqueror, and after a reign of thirty years was succeeded by his son who bore his name but did nothing worthy of notice." This son is the king whom we have taken to be the Shishac of Scripture in our former paper. "After this king," Diodorus adds, "there was a multitude of successors who did nothing worthy to be recorded; and after many generations, '*Amasis*' became king, and governed with great severity."

We deem it to be quite clear, that this is a distinct chronicle down to the time of that "*Amasis*," who put Apries the last of the Pharaohs to death and usurped his throne, and was the last king before the conquest of Egypt by Cambyzes. But Diodorus does not treat the matter at all in that way; for, continuing

his account with another succession of kings, he seems to regard this *Amasis* the successor of Sesostris after many generations, as the king of the same name who stands at head of the eighteenth dynasty of Manetho's list, and was he who expelled the shepherds in the time of Abraham; and so before the rise of the Osirian kings, and dominant in the throne at least 800 years before the age of the first Sesostris.

The misapplication of "*this Post-Sesostrian Amasis*" to "*the Pre-Osirian Amosis*" is perfectly evident; since the successors to this interpolated king were first "*Actiasin*" an *Ethiopian conqueror*, and to him "*Mendes*," or as some call him by a *Prosonomia*, "*Marro*," an indigenous king; a succession which sufficiently points to the advent of the first Osiris and his followers, the "*Mendes*" and "*Marro*" of his northern conquests. After this reversion to the old kings of the 19th century B.C., Diodorus makes the next named king after "*Marro*" to appear as the contemporary with the Trojan war. This he calls Ketes, the Proteus of the Greek story; and seven generations after this king, he brings upon the stage "*Nilus*," the husband of Memphis, who by this reckoning must have lived some fifty generations after his mistress. From this Nilus in four descents only follows Gnephactus and the succession of kings historically known of the eighth century B.C.; and then again the list ends with "*Amasis*" the usurper, as happens in the first section.

There are then evidently two lines of succession in this account, interlarded with a dash of more remote history as a link between the two to unite them together; but in their main threads, both extending rightly from the time of the last Osirian kings, down to the extinction of the old Pharaohs by the dethronement of Apries and the usurpation of Amasis, about the middle of the sixth century B.C. In the form given by Diodorus, this succession is a mass of confusion perfectly inexplicable; but all this vanishes away and presents an aspect perfectly clear and historical, by reducing it to two lines of succession in a parallel arrangement, divided at the name of the first Amasis, and deduced in collateral order to the period of the second one.

Before we proceed to shew this, we must observe however as to the statement with regard to Menes and his descendant kings at the head of the account; that these descendants reigned through a line of fifty-two generations and for a period of 1040 years; that we take this to be plainly an independent record of the real lineage of that king and his successors down to their extinction in Apries, as we have shewn it in the arrangement we have made of the dynasties of Manetho in our last paper.

Diodorus's statement, that it was after the extinction of that race of kings that Busiris took the throne, is plainly a part only of the system of exaggeration we have above referred to for upholding a spurious antiquity, by tagging collateral successions to the end of one another. For the refutation of that preposterous account needs no other proof than those very tables of Manetho, which shew the race of Menes as the ancestors of that Sesostris, who appears upon the stage long after the age of Busiris in this history of Diodorus. We had arrived at this conclusion long before the arrangement was made of those tables in their fourfold division; and it was not without some surprise, perhaps we may say satisfaction, that we found the succession of the Theban kings as they appear in that arrangement;—taking only the few kings of the Thinitic list who reigned before the Exodus in the place of those of the eighteenth dynasty for the same period;—to concur exactly with this isolated statement of the Greek historian. And the same agreement will be found also in the 1040 years of that succession, with so small a difference as may be disregarded. The principles on which that arrangement was accomplished, which we have fully explained in the introductory part of that paper, will shew at once that this result could not have been brought about by any design in that work; and we may say therefore without apprehension of any distrust, that this agreement in the periods, *which seems to give an absolute confirmation to the succession we have adopted*, did not present itself till some time after the publication of our last paper. For a full explication of this we must refer our reader to the list of Theban kings in our last number; but the succession will be found correctly stated in the following synopsis; viz.; Of the first dynasty of Thinites, the house of Menes, there will be found five kings down to the year of the Exodus; of the elected kings of Thebes, the twenty-first dynasty, seven kings; the twenty-second dynasty, nine kings; part of the twenty-third dynasty, three kings down to the Trojan war; altogether twenty-four kings down to that period. Then follows the hereditary kings: the nineteenth dynasty, six kings; the twentieth dynasty, twelve kings; “Zet” of the twenty-third, and Boccoris of the twenty-fourth dynasties, two kings; the twenty-fifth dynasty, reckoned one king both by Diodorus and Herodotus; and the twenty-sixth dynasty down to “Vaphres,” with whom the race of Pharaohs ceased, seven kings; altogether twenty-eight kings from the Trojan war, which added to the twenty-four before that period, makes the fifty-two successions according to the statement of Diodorus.

The *thousand and forty years* of the same statement com-

puted from the end of the reign of Menes, which appears to be the meaning of the passage, has the same congruity with the period shewn by the tables in that same succession. For in our former paper we have shewn that that course of succession, with some necessary corrections, gave an interval from the date of the Exodus to the Persian conquest of 966 years. But Apries the last Pharaoh was dethroned and put to death forty-four years before the date of that conquest by Cambyses the Persian; and in the present computation, that interval must be deducted from 966 years, leaving the true period from the death of Vaphres to the Exodus 922 years. If then to this sum we add 115 years, which the tables shew between the year of the Exodus and the last year of Menes, these together will make the period 1037 years, which differs only by three years from the statement of Diodorus. As the 1040 years in fifty-two reigns is the product of those reigns multiplied by 20; viz., $52 \times 20 = 1040$; it may be regarded as a statement in round numbers, with which the tables virtually agree. To this result, if we add the years of *Menes*, whose reign was for sixty-two years, we shall arrive at the year B.C. 1668, as the epoch of that king's accession; for the 1037 years from Apries added to the 62 of that reign, and that added to the year B.C. 569, in which year *Apries* was dethroned, will together amount to 1668 years; which is the epoch we have assigned to a reign of that king, and from which we have deduced the succession of the four collateral kingdoms in our former paper.

These computations concur in so extraordinary a manner with this independent statement of Diodorus, as seems to render it almost impossible that they can be founded in error; an observation we trust, which will not be taken as said in any boastful spirit, but rather with the hope of inducing an impartial investigation of the subject by our readers.

But we must return to Diodorus and our more direct analysis of his account by the way we have proposed, which is by exhibiting his one protracted succession in a parallelism of the two presumed successions under a division of the accounts. In that form they will appear as follows:—

FIRST LINE.

Menes through fifty-two descents and 1040 years.

- 1 Busiris and eight sons, who succeeded in rotation the last of the same name as the first, being the builder of Thebes.^b
- 7 Seven descents.
- 1 Uchoreus, who built *Memphis*, named after his daughter, who married *Nilus*
- 12 Twelve generations to Moeris, who built two of the Pyramids.
- 7 Seven generations to Sesostris, the conqueror.

—
28

Descents to Sesostris corresponding with the tables.

The son of Sesostris, not distinguished or worthy of notice.

After many inglorious reigns.

Amasis, a tyrannical king.

It must be evident to the most cursory observation, that these lists are fragments of different dynasties, appended to one another; but both disclosing successions which are in the main numerically right. The entry of "*Ketes*," with the "*Five Generations*" which accompany his name, has been transposed from an earlier position, assigned to them by the historian, from an evident necessity. For these are placed by him in immediate sequence to the names of *Actiasin* and *Marro* or *Mendes*, the companions of the Osirian kings and their colonial vice-regents; if we may follow the traditions connected with their names.

SECOND LINE.

Actiasin, an Ethiopian, and Mendes or Marro.

- 1 Remphis.
- 7 Seven kings, slothful and inglorious.
- 1 *Nilus*.
- 8 The eighth king from Nilus Chambres, who built the largest of the Pyramids.
- 1 Chabyris, son of Chambres, who built another Pyramid.
- 5 Interregnum of five generations.
- 1 Then Ketes or Proteus about the time of the Trojan war.

—
24

Descents to the Trojan war corresponding with the tables.

After much time.

Mycerinus.

Bocchoris.

Sabaco, the Ethiopian.

Psammeticus.

Four generations.

Apries.

Amasis, the usuper.

^b Diodorus says: "Καὶ τῶν τέττε πάλιν ἐκγόνων ὀκτά," denoting a succession of brothers; speaking of the succession in lineal descent, he writes: "τῶν δὲ τέττε τῆ Βασιλείως ἀπογόνων ὄγδοος" (§ 50). This succession of eight sons is nearly paralleled by that of the five sons of "*Ananus*," who succeeded to the high priesthood of the Jews in that order.—Joseph., *Antiq.*, b. xx., chap. ix., § 1.

But there is a chasm in the succession between the pyramid-building kings and the Trojan war which that entry supplies, and to which place it undoubtedly belongs. There it stands, four generations before the age of Sesostris, whose reign we have found in one of our former papers to have commenced in the year B.C. 1034: and its proper parallel place.

With this emendation, and regarding the names of Menes and the brief notice of his successors, as well as that of the Ethiopian Mendes and Marro, as anomalous augmentations to genuine fragmental lines, the two lists will be found to harmonize with wonderful accuracy, and so as to explain and support one another. For in this conjunct state, the age of *Nilus* and his wife *Memphis* whose marriage forms part of the country traditions, are found to fall together; and the builders of the pyramids are also shewn as contemporary kings;—a point, in our apprehension, of considerable weight. For that gigantic mania could hardly have slumbered for a thousand years and then revived again, as it must have done according to the continuous arrangement of these successions by Diodorus. As well, we deem, might we look for a revival of the Crusades in our own times, after the lapse of centuries since that monstrous infatuation possessed the kings of Europe. The many inglorious reigns between the *second Sesostris*, and *Amasis* the tyrant, which closes the first list, completely answers also to the period of the short reigned kings, shewn by the tables as the successors of *Shishac*, the son of the great Sesostris; though there is a want of notice of the terminating events of that period, by the coming of Sabaco and the reigns after him. But as the object was to continue the line from a new root, the introduction of these notices might not have suited the informants of the historian.

The point for particular observation in this arrangement is, that both the lines terminate at the right place with that *Amasis* who closed the succession of the old kings, by putting its last representative to death and usurping his crown: while the generations, which precede the two *Sesostridæ* in one line and the *Trojan war* in the other, tally exactly with those of the dynasties of Manetho, as we have arranged them; and the further lists from those epochs, though irregular and conveyed in general terms, do yet answer to the true nature of its successions in that interval. Both lines, with due allowance for those general references to unchronicled periods which occasionally occur, may be taken to give the same fifty-two generations; which Diodorus states constituted the course of that line of kings, and which are found in the Theban succession of the arranged tables.

The desultory nature of this inquiry will afford excuse for our stopping at this point, to offer a few observations on the ascription we have made of the "*second Sesostris*" to the character of the scriptural "*Shishac*;" differing, in so doing, from the opinion of Sir Isaac Newton, who regarded the first or *great Sesostris* as that king. But besides the course of succession of the tables, which brings the date of the first Sesostris to a period of about thirty years before the accession of Solomon to the Jewish throne, we think it clear from the course of history, that the great conqueror and opener of the East must have preceded the reign of that king. The traffic of the Jews in the first years of Solomon's reign, when he had a fleet at Ezion Geber, and from thence traded with the countries of the Indian Ocean, could only have happened after those conquests which swept those seas of the piratical bands that frequented them, and was one of the works particularly ascribed to the great Sesostris; and by such an amity between the two countries, as the marriage of Solomon with a daughter of the conqueror would have elicited. The visit of the Queen of Sheba to Jerusalem indicates the same thing; and that a common dominion must have been established over all those countries between Ethiopia and Judæa, through which the queen's journey lay. For the traditions relate, that the conqueror of that period had in fact subdued Ethiopia, Arabia and all the troglodital nations on the coast of the Red Sea. One can hardly doubt therefore, that that Sesostris must have lived before the accession of Solomon, and that it was from him the Jewish king received the Egyptian daughter in marriage.

It is quite the reverse with "*Shishac*," who answers to the character of the unworthy and oppressive king, with whom the tables shew the system of short reigns and the 200 years of tyranny, took their commencement. It was in the very lifetime of Solomon who was the husband of his sister, that *Shishac* received the enemies of the Jewish monarch into his protection, and associated one of them with his own family in marriage; and who, after the death of Solomon, at once shewed his hostility to his successor by his expedition against Jerusalem. But the vastness of his preparations against so small a province seems rather the pompous display of an imbecile and vindictive mind, than the expedition of a great conqueror whose arms had traversed the length and breadth of the habitable world:—the gathering of his Libyan and Troglodital hordes together also for that campaign, manifests plainly a subsisting state of empire over those people, well organized and not the fruits of a new conquest. Altogether, it seems impossible to doubt that

the true state of the case was such as the tables shew; that it was the first Sesostris who was the conqueror, and the second the Shishac of Scripture and the oppressor of his people.

We must now briefly turn to two other of the chronological notices of Diodorus; which we think admit in both cases of probable explication, by reducing the periods by which the reckonings are computed. For thus he writes:—"The Egyptians affirm that the gods reigned a little short *Ἐτη βραχὺ λείποντα* of 18,000 years, and that Horus the son of Isis was the last of the gods who reigned: and that Isis, for whom Bubastus was built and had Egypt for her appanage was the daughter of Cronus, the youngest of the gods and the mother of Horus the king:—and that after the gods, men reigned nearly 5000 years down to the 180th Olympiad," answering to the year B.C. 56.^f

We have put these two statements together, because they shew there were two notions subsisting, as to the families of the gods: one which terminated their line with Cronus, the father of the first Osiris, and the other with Horus. For the difference may account for some variation in the periods ascribed to the kingly dynasties by the traditions; which we think exists to the extent that difference would require.

With regard then first to the 5000 years, ascribed to the reign of men down to B.C. 56; its true measure is probably found by regarding the periods as the "*seasons*," by which we have before seen some of the old computations were made, and of which there were reckoned three in the natural years: for 5000 of such periods would amount to 1666 solar years, and carry back the date to B.C. 1722; and as Diodorus reckons by round chiliads, and says the period was something short of the 5000 years, it appears to agree sufficiently with the date of that change which commenced in Horus, as we have shewn, about the year B.C. 1682.

The 18,000 years reign of the gods is more difficult; but this is again reckoned in round chiliads, and said to be something short of the full number: a reduction to monthly periods would render this too great a time to be receivable; and what occurs to ourselves is, that it probably refers to a course of days, commensurate with the number of their gods: viz., "*Twelve-day courses*," of which there would be thirty in a year; inverting the monthly computation, of which there were thirty days, and twelve periods in a year. This hypothesis would require a division of the heavens into thirty stages or houses, according to the astrological system of the Chaldæans, which prevailed

^f L. 1, § 27 and 44.

generally in the early period we are treating of. Such a division, we shall observe, also, would follow the yearly course of the planet *Saturn*, the great *Hesus* or chief of their gods, as well as that of the moon in the ecliptic; and there is no doubt that such a division both of the day and sphere, existed in those early times. The thirty boundary stones of the great druidical temple at Stonehenge, indicates that division of the outer circle of the heavens amongst that people; and a division of the day into thirty parts is still found in existence among the old families of the island of Ceylon; a people who are certainly of the same family as the Coptic or old Egyptians, and the very same race who were settled in that country when the Osirian rulers visited it. We find an analogous course of reckoning among the Jews, whose cycle of *seven days* was allowed, one to each of its twenty-four courses of the priesthood; and their days, following that sacerdotal division, were divided into twenty-four hours:—our hypothesis would shew a twelve day cycle, distributed into thirty courses, with a day of thirty hours also. We must leave the suggestion to our readers' own judgment; but the reduction of that long tale of years by such a divisor, would bring it to a period of 600 solar years; which added to the epoch of the reign of Horus B.C. 1682, would carry back the period of the commencement of the gods to B.C. 2282, or to about sixty years after the flood; answering very well to the age of Shem and Arphaxad, and the commencing period of those twelve generations of Sanchoniathon, which he deduces from that period down to *Cronus*, who is called "*the youngest of the gods*," as he was the last of the patriarchal descents. Having regard to the evident "*graft*" of the Egyptian theology upon that of the Syrian, this appears to afford a probable explication of the matter. From *Cronus*, who is in the parallel generation with Jacob, the second line of descent brings in the second Osiris and Horus both god and king, and the contemporary of Menes. From Jacob, the second descent brings in Manesseh the son of Joseph who is the evident contemporary of Menes, and parallel with the closing line of the Osirian gods.

This cycle then may be taken also to afford an interpretation of the 36,525 years ascribed to the dynasties, noticed at the beginning of this paper. For divided by thirty, that number will shew a period of 1217 years; and counted from the end of the Pharaohs, as we have before done B.C. 569, it will carry back the date of the epoch to B.C. 1786. By this we should see the race of kings carried back to the time of *Cronus*; and *Cronus*, as the last of the gods, to whom the Osirian kings would follow in succession; a difference from other reckonings,

which shew Horus as the last of the gods, as we have before noticed.

There is a singular custom among some of the Tartar families, and Sir J. Bowring mentions the same to exist among the Siamese, of naming the twelve divisions of the day after the names of different animals ; and their years have a similar cycle of revolutions allotted to them, which is called "*The Giagh*." We ask can this division, which is undoubtedly of great antiquity, have originated in those same circumstances whatever they were, which gave rise to the Egyptian tradition that in a war between the gods and giants, the twelve gods were constrained to conceal themselves in the forms of different animals ?⁹ For it is very remarkable, in connexion with the above custom, that Diodorus in his notice of the old divisions of the Egyptian time and their various modes of computation, follows his account with a desultory one of this race of giants, whom he says lived in the age of Isis, and were thought to have been born out of the earth. The subject appears so wholly irrelevant to the preceding and succeeding matters of his narrative, that one is disposed to believe that he must have received it in connexion with the other information he obtained, as to the various ways of reckoning the times of their traditions among the Egyptians, of which he has just before treated ; and not knowing how to apply it specifically to that subject, he gave it in the same connexion as he received it, without further comment. If the Tartar cycle of "*the Giagh*" has any traditional reference to the story of the *giants*, we may regard the passage of Diodorus in referring to that story in connexion with the subject of the old cycles of computation, as one of the most singular "*undesigned coincidences*" that can be met with.

How the division of the day into "*thirty hours*" got to *Ceylon* is not easy to say. The old families of that island were certainly connected with the localities of the Cassian Mount and the pristine seats of the *Misraim*, to the north of Egypt and the Red Sea ; and, as part of the old CAPHTORIM, they were probably intimately concerned in the early settlements of that country. The thirty hours and thirty years' cycle were, no doubt then associated with the fountain worship of the same people, and may have been confined to that institute, which was settled at "*On*" or Heliopolis. In some way that veneration for "*the Fountain*" became associated with the *Druidism* of western Europe, and with it would have followed probably the thirty years' cycle, recognized in their institutions. From thence proceeded the thirty

⁹ Lucian, *De Sacrif.*, p. 5.

boundary stones of their astrological temple at Stonehenge ; and from the same source the division of our own Wales, an especially druidical region, may have been made into its "*thirty Princedoms*," or two fifteens of the north and south districts of that territory.

In this way then, we have found four different computations given by Diodorus reduced either by recognized divisions, or such as are not inappropriate to the nature of the traditions of the country, to periods which concur with the authentic tables of their kings and the traditional ones of their gods. *The first* : in the *twenty-three thousand years* between the reign of Helium and the historian's visit to Egypt, which is shewn to go back rightly to the epoch of Abraham's secession from his paternal land in "*Ur*," with which the date of *Helium* agrees, according to the tables of Sanchoniathon. *Secondly* : the *five thousand years* of the reign of men, which is shewn to refer to the beginning of the eighteenth century B.C., which was the period when the last of the gods were in power, and on the eve of the new dynasty of men in Horus. *Thirdly* : the *eighteen thousand years of the gods* who preceded that new regime, which by another and more ancient division runs through the patriarchal ages, and stops at its proper limit in the first descendant from Noah, as the Phœnician genealogies also do. And, *fourthly* : the 36,525 years of the dynasties, which by the same division of the last reaches up to *Cronus*, the last of the gods. While the succession of kings, given by Diodorus in his historical summary, when divided into their duplicate order under the most necessary requisition, shew a series of kings which answers numerically with the utmost exactness, to those of the tables of Manetho in the division we have made of them.

We had proposed to examine the several traditions of Herodotus in the same way ; but we think our readers must have had enough of us ; and we shall therefore confine ourselves to one statement from that author ; and that because we have before referred to it. That is, that from *the time of the first king of Egypt* to the end of the reign of *Sethon*, the priest of Vulcan, there were 340 generations of men ; and in those generations there were the *same number of high priests and kings*.^h This fact we have applied to the elucidation of the concurrent lists of kings and demigods, between "*Horus*" and the "*Exodus*," which we have shewn in a former page ; but if it were true as to the whole period spoken of down to Sethon, it must have been in some institution of which there is neither memorial or tradition.

But Herodotus deduces a computation from these 340 gene-

^h Euterp., 142—4.

rations as derived from the Egyptians, that these generations should be counted as three to every century, by which the whole period would amount to about 13,700 years. Now it is beyond a doubt to our apprehension, that the historian or his informants have inverted the order of arrangement in this computation; which should have been, not of "*three generations of thirty-three years each*;" but of "*thirty-three generations*" of "*three years each*" in every century. For that was the cycle by which the courses of the sun and moon were regulated, who were the celestial Osiris and Isis of their worship; when, at the end of every three years or thirty-six lunations an intercalary month was added, making their true cycle to be constituted of thirty-seven months. Three hundred and forty of such generations would by the multiple of three amount to 1020 years; and that, dated back from the year B.C. 687, the end of the reign of *Sethon*, would reach to the year B.C. 1707; being again, the very period when the change of dynasty was about happening, by which *Horus* commenced his reign in the double capacity of king and god; and when the lists of the two sovereign powers took their commencement in a course which proceeds with equal steps from that date down to the time of the Exodus, as we have shewn in the parallel lists in page 350. That the reigns which Herodotus speaks of in this notice refer to the first Osirian kings and not to any more ancient race, appears by the sequel of his observations: namely, that before those successions it was admitted, that "*gods*" had reigned over Egypt and inhabited it with men. And of those gods he adds, "One of them had always held a paramount authority: after whom '*Horus*' the son of Osiris reigned as '*the first king*' though numbered with the gods."ⁱ

This reference to a supremacy by one ruler over his competitors in those transition dynasties;—and the succession of "*Horus*" upon their extinction, not by a new inheritance, but by a change of his caste from "god" to "king," in whom we find the same supremacy maintained over the new kingdoms; is so accordant with the deductions we have made as to the state of those kingdoms from the new arrangement of Manetho's tables, and gives so strong a sanction to that division and the course of events deduced from that view of them, as appears wholly confirmatory of the hypothesis we have proposed in these papers.

H. M. G.

Hitcham Rectory, 21st Sept. 1857.

ⁱ Euterp., 144.

THE BOOK OF TOBIT.

It is very desirable that the apocryphal books of the Bible should be carefully investigated. This is the more necessary, as the Council of Trent has claimed for many of them an authority equal to that of the books of the Hebrew Canon; and declared them to be inspired. The Reformed Churches, on the other hand, reject them, and at most admit their perusal for "example of life and instruction of manners, but do not apply them to establish any doctrine." Among these apocryphal books, that which bears the name of Tobit is one of the most prominent. Very recently a writer of the Romish Church has published a work in which he discusses and defends its authenticity.^a Yet he prudently, as we think, avoids the question of its canonicity. We propose a brief examination of Tobit, with a view to throw light on these questions; and we shall also consider somewhat the external evidence which can be adduced. We shall commence with the former, assuming that our readers are already acquainted with the plan of the book. Now as it is the version contained in the Vulgate for which canonical authority is claimed, we shall make use of that, employing for the sake of convenience the language of the Douay translation.^b

Chap. i. ver. 1. "Tobias, of the tribe and city of Nepthali." No such place as Nepthali appears on record: the Greek makes Tobit come from Thisbe. *Naason*, another name which is unknown as the name of a place, and not found in the Greek text. *Sephet*, this place is also unknown, and not mentioned in the Greek.

Ver. 2. "He was made captive in the days of Salmanezer, king of the Assyrians." The tribe to which Tobit belonged was taken captive by Tiglath-Pileser, nearly twenty years before (2 Kings xv. 29). Those who were taken captive by Shalmanezer, were placed in Halah and Habor, and not in Nineveh, as asserted in ver. 11. See 2 Kings xvii. 6; and xviii. 11.

Ver 4. "When he was younger than any of the tribe of Nepthali." To say the least an absurdity.

^a Das Buch Tobias, übersetzt und erklärt, von Lic. Fr. Heinrich Reusch. Freiburg, 1857. (*The Book of Tobit translated and explained.*)

^b It would unduly protract this paper, to compare the Vulgate with the other versions. The Vulgate has in itself no advantage over others. Jerome admits that he made it in one day; that it was translated from the *viva voce* rendering of the Chaldee into Hebrew (by a Jew, perhaps); that an amanuensis wrote at his dictation the version thus lazily made; and that he himself repudiates its canonical authority. It is this very version which the Tridentine Council placed in the same rank as Moses and Isaiah!

Ver. 6. "Went to Jerusalem." Considering the relations of Israel and Judah at the time, a most improbable circumstance.

Ver. 7. "Proselytes." Prior to the first captivity, proselytes are seldom mentioned as a distinct class.^c Moreover, if Tobit gave *all* his first-fruits and tithes at Jerusalem, how could he give a third of all every third year to proselytes and strangers?

Ver. 9. "When he was a man." It would appear from this that Tobit the younger was born soon after his father attained to manhood.

Ver. 16. "When he was come to Rages." This city was ten days journey east of Ecbatana, and is frequently named in Tobit. We shall have to speak of it again.^d

Ver. 18. "Sennacherib his son." Shalmanezer appears to have been immediately succeeded by Sargon, and it is very doubtful whether Sennacherib was his son.^e

Ver. 21. "Tobias buried their bodies." What is here and elsewhere related of the burial of Israelites by Tobit seems scarcely credible. It is hard to believe that they were slain and cast out in such numbers; and if they were, that Tobit could act as he did, and escape apprehension.

Chap. ii. ver. 11. "As he was sleeping, hot dung out of a swallow's nest fell upon his eyes, and he was made blind." This is either a puerile fiction, or a curious miracle. The reader must decide which.

Ver. 12. "Holy Job." The writer seems to have been endeavouring to describe a character more excellent than that of Job, with whose history not a few of the incidents here recorded may be compared.

Ver. 18. "That life which God will give." The expression of a hope of a future life, which finds no parallel in the Old Testament.

Ver. 21. "When her husband heard it bleating," etc. If Anna supported herself, her husband, and her son, by weaving, it is very strange he should be so ignorant of what she did and

^c It is not meant here, that there were no proselytes, but it is meant to suggest, that at the time supposed there were very few, and not a class of dependents upon the offerings of the pious. We must, it appears, admit the liberty of Tobit to devote his tithes to such objects. See Deut. xxvi. 12; and Joseph., *Antiq.*, iv., 8, 8, 22.

^d Some have supposed this is an anachronism, but there is every reason to believe that Raga, or Ragaë, was founded before the time of Seleucus Nicator, who was its restorer. Strabo, who ascribes its foundation to Nicator, says it was 500 stadia from the celebrated Caspian Pylæ.

^e Some authors identify Shalmanezer with Sargon, as M. von Niebuhr, in his new *History of Assyria and Babylon*; but, as we think, on insufficient grounds.

earned. Her reply may remind us of Job's wife; and the first verses of the following chapter contain expressions similar to some which fell from Job's lips.

Chap. iii. ver. 7. "Now it happened on the same day." The coincidences here alluded to are altogether unlikely. *Rages*. The reader will note this.^f

Ver. 8. "She had been given to seven husbands, and a devil named Asmodeus had killed them." The Rabbins record many strange things of this same Asmodeus.^g The occurrence of the name renders it highly improbable that the book was written at so early a date as is claimed for it. The story itself involves a doctrine which it would be difficult to defend from Scripture, since evil spirits are not supposed to have power over life. The way in which the tale is told is alone sufficient to shake its credit.

Ver. 25. "The holy angel of the Lord, Raphael, was sent to heal them both." That is, Tobit of his blindness, and Sara of her affliction. Here, again, we are met with a difficulty. *Raphael* is sent to *heal* them. Now the name never occurs in the Canonical books as the name of an angel, although it occurs in Rabbinical writings. It is derived from the words רפא, *to heal*, and אלהים, *God*, and signifies "the healer of God," or "whom God heals." All this part of the narrative betrays a later age, when the Jewish system had received the addition of foreign elements.

Chap. iv. ver. 11, 12. "For alms deliver from all sin, and from death," etc. A doctrine is here broached which is not only unsupported by Scripture, but directly opposed to it, and of a most dangerous tendency. If alms deliver from all sin, from death, and will not suffer the soul to go into darkness, and give great confidence before God; all that men have to do is to give alms. Of course almsgiving is a duty, right, profitable and honourable, but to make it a saviour is to set aside the divine method of salvation. Similar expressions in the other apocryphal books prove nothing, and the same is true of inaccurate translations from those that are canonical.

Ver. 21. "I tell thee also, my son, that I lent ten talents of silver," etc. It is very strange that amid all his poverty, Tobit had not thought of this money before, and that he should not take steps to recover it till he supposed himself about to die. We should infer, moreover, from the words, "*Rages*, a city of the Medes," that Gabelus resided in the same city as Raguel; comp. ch. iii. 7. Such, however, was not the case. The Douay

^f The Greek here reads "Ecbatana," which is a consistent rendering.

^g See Buxtorf's *Lex. Chal.*, *sub voce*, for illustrations of this.

translators, or their editors, endeavour to escape from the difficulty by assuming that the Rages of Raguel was Ecbatana, also called Rages. This assumption requires proof.

Chap. v. ver. 7. "Of the children of Israel." A direct falsehood put into the mouth of an angel.

Ver. 8. "Rages, a city of the Medes, which is situate in the Mount of Ecbatana." It is admitted that Rages was ten days' journey from Ecbatana, or 200 miles, how then could its situation be that here described?

Ver. 18. "I am Azarias, the son of the great Ananias." Another positive falsehood ascribed to the angel. We must suppose that the end justified the means.

Ver. 23. "Thou hast taken away the staff of our old age." A very inconsiderate expression, remembering the object of young Tobit's journey. And moreover, the young man does not seem to have contributed much to the support of the family.

Chap. vi. ver. 1. "He lodged the first night by the river of Tigris."^h As their route lay directly away from the Tigris, it is hard to see how this can be true, inasmuch as Nineveh, from which they set out, stood upon the river.

Ver. 2. "A monstrous fish came up to devour him." As we might expect, no one has been able to point to fish with man-eating propensities inhabiting the Tigris. The editor of the new edition of Tobit very prudently discourages all inquiry into the matter.

Ver. 4. "Take him by the gill." This part of the story would suggest to us that the fish could not be so very large after all, however stupid it might be.

Ver. 5. "Lay up his heart, and his gall, and his liver." At ver. 8 we are told, "If thou put a little piece of its heart upon coals, the smoke thereof driveth away all kind of devils," etc. At ver. 19, on the contrary, Tobit is instructed "to lay the *liver* of the fish on the fire, and the devil shall be driven away." And at chap. 8, ver. 2, we find that the *liver* and not the heart was used.

Ver. 6. "The rest they salted, as much as might serve them till they came to Rages," etc. Where two men alone, and by a river side, could find the salt and conveniences for salting, is a question hard to solve. And besides, a load of salted fish for twenty days' journey for two, would be rather a heavy burden. Besides, the process of salting and curing fresh-water fish, would require longer time than a single evening.

^h Reusch thinks one of the accessories of the Tigris must be meant, but this is not supported by the text.

Ver. 9. "The gall is good for anointing the eyes in which there is a white speck, and they shall be cured." The obtuse Tobit does not perceive that he has now a remedy for his father's blindness, and rejoice accordingly, and even propose to return. No such thing, but very coolly turns round and says, Where shall we lodge? As to the peculiar virtue here ascribed to the gall of the fish, it may be enough to say that an opinion very widely prevailed of the efficacy of certain fishes' gall in diseases of the eyes. Thus Pliny in his *Natural History* (lib. xxxii., cap. vii.) says of the Callionymus: "Callionymi fel cicatrices sanat et carnes oculorum supervacuas consumit." And again, of the coracinus and sea-scorpion, "Et coracini fel excitat visum. Et marini scorpionis rufi cum oleo vetere aut melle Attico, incipientes suffusiones discutit: inungi oportet intermissis diebus. Eadem ratio (curatio) albugines oculorum tollit." Both Aristotle and Ælian speak of the virtues above ascribed to the Callionymus; but unfortunately for our story it is only "de gobiorum marinorum genere," a species of sea-gudgeon, and can no more be transformed into Tobit's fresh-water monster, than frogs into megalosauri.

Ver. 11. "Here is one whose name is Raguel." A comparison of this place with ch. iii. ver. 7, shews that Raguel resided at Rages, according to the Vulgate (see the note on ch. iv. 21). It is to be observed, also, that while the fish salted on the Tigris lasted them till they came to Rages, it appears from the subsequent narrative that Tobit never went there at all, and that Raphael took special provisions for his journey thither without him. What follows about pre-arranging a matrimonial alliance with Sara, with an eye to her father's property, is both improbable and inconsistent. Tobit is shewn how to overcome the devil in another way, and thus goes forward doubly armed, with holy resolutions, and a fish's gall.

Chap. vii. This story of the marriage, and other parts of the account of Tobit's journey, have been apparently written with a reference to the histories of Isaac and Jacob. At the same time, to suit the taste of a credulous age, an air of the marvellous is thrown over the narrative, and that, by a strange artistic oversight, without making the chief actors aware of it. All the miracles and wonders almost, here set forth, are treated as if of every-day occurrence. Not the least marvel in this book would be a marriage celebrated under the circumstances here recorded.

Chap. viii. ver. 2. "Tobias, remembering the angel's word, took out of his bag part of the liver, and laid it upon burning coals." This was on the wedding night, in the bridal chamber, while the bride was there. The roasting of the liver was to scare

away the devil, which must have been quite needless, as Raphael was there with power to seize him and carry him away to Upper Egypt, and bind him. We naturally ask, Why Tobit did not tell Raguel of the remedy he had in his possession? He seems to have been particularly wanting in promptness. The night journey of Raphael deserves comparison with that of Mahomet. It is strange that he could carry away and bind in the desert of Upper Egypt, Asmodeus, and return, as it would seem, without being missed.

Ver. 11. "To dig a grave." For whom? Had they not given away their daughter to Tobit in the assurance that it was God's will, and would be for good? (chap. vii. 13—20). Why then now does he go out before daylight to dig a grave? Dig a grave, when we have such an account of the marriage as we find in the previous chapter! How could "they make merry" if they expected such a catastrophe?

Chap. ix. ver. 3. "Go to Gabelus to Rages." The marriage of Tobit had taken place at Rages, and yet now we find that Tobit neither is there nor intends to go, but sends Raphael. That the latter comforted himself with the relics of the salted fish till he came to his journey's end, does not appear, but he took with him four servants and two camels. This may have been because he was somewhat wearied with his conflict with Asmodeus and journey to Upper Egypt. It is to be feared that the binding of the devil was a very temporary affair, although the account reminds us of that in the Apocalypse, which is of course free from the absurdities of this.ⁱ It is evident that Tobias was of a very confiding disposition, or he would not have entrusted his "note of hand" for ten talents of silver to persons who were utter strangers to him. According to the common reckoning, the sum due to Tobit was no less than £3,415 3s. 11½d., and yet he leaves the entire responsibility in the hands of his friend with his four servants and two camels. Is it too much to ask whether it was customary, or rather if it was not madness, to risk such an amount of treasure in such a country, and at such a time? For be it observed, the owners of this wealth were captive Jews, downtrodden and oppressed; men who could be murdered and cast out, and none to bury them, if this book is true. There is another difficulty arising from the possession of ten talents of silver by such persons; its extreme improbability. And is it not monstrous to expect us to believe that two men unprotected set out on foot from Nineveh for Rages, a

ⁱ See Rev. xx. 2, 3. Reusch plainly shuns the difficulty of chap. viii. 3, Calmet on the contrary is inclined to defend it.

distance of 500 miles, to carry back an amount of silver which must have weighed 1,364lbs.! By weights and measures, more impostors may be detected than we are wont to think. In much the same way it might be shewn that the journey to Gabelus and his ready payment of the money, and his return before the marriage festival was over, will not bear analysis.

Chap. x. ver. 10. "Men-servants, and women-servants." Then Raguel, himself in captivity, was a slave-holder. We say nothing about the abstract question of slavery, but merely ask if this is within the range of historic verity and credibility? The account of his great wealth is moreover very hard to believe, inasmuch as it is assumed in the Douay Version that this was but sixteen years after they were carried away captive, and but five years after Sennacherib's return from Judea, when enraged by defeat and disaster, he massacred the Israelites (see chap. i. 21). Let those who can, believe in the quiet possession of so much wealth under the circumstances.

Chap. xi. ver. 1. "They came to Charan, which is in the midway to Nineve, the eleventh day." No such place as Charan is known on the route from Rages or Ecbatana to Nineveh.^j

Ver. 5. "Anna sat beside the way daily, on the top of a hill." It is well known that Nineveh lay in a plain, and not in a hilly country.

Chap. xii. ver. 9. "Alms delivereth from death, and the same is that which purgeth away sins, and maketh to find mercy and life everlasting." Here we have re-asserted the efficacy of alms for pardon and salvation (see above on chap iv. ver. 11).

Ver. 12. "I offered thy prayer to the Lord." This passage distinctly affirms a doctrine which is unknown to the canonical books—that angels are our mediators with God. The Scriptures affirm that "there is one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus."

Ver. 15. "I am the angel Raphael, one of the seven who stand before the Lord." The doctrine of a later age, and subsequent to the Babylonish captivity.

Ver. 19. "I seemed indeed to eat and to drink with you." Raphael confesses that he had deceived them.

Chap. xiii. ver. 11, etc. This chapter supposes the captivity of Judah and the overthrow of Jerusalem, which nevertheless did not take place till many years afterwards.^k

^j Charan or Harran, as is well known, was a city in the north-western part of Mesopotamia. The name is omitted in the Greek text.

^k Or about 588 years B.C., according to the received chronology.

Chap. xiv. ver. 1. "Saw the children of his grandchildren." It may be said that this is possible, since he lived forty-two years after his son's marriage, but it is not very probable.

Ver. 15. "Saw his children's children to the fifth generation." This is a manifest impossibility, since the younger Tobit is said to have died at the age of ninety-nine, and he must have been between sixty and seventy at the death of his father, when he had only grandchildren.¹

The above are some of the passages to which exception may be taken, and it will appear from them how difficult it is for us to receive, as inspired, a book containing so much that will not bear examination. We are utterly unable to accept it as a purely historical narrative, if the Vulgate is to be taken as the standard. An examination of the Greek and other versions would lead to similar conclusions, although, as we shall have occasion to remark, they differ from each other and from the Vulgate in an extraordinary degree. On internal grounds, therefore, we conclude against the authenticity and canonical authority of the book of Tobit. It may be urged that it is to be understood figuratively, but as this is a theory, unsupported by evidence, and rejected by the Church of Rome, we shall not stop to discuss it.

Let us come, therefore, to the second point, and ask what external evidence there is for the authenticity and canonical authority of this book?

Do we find it in the language in which it was written? Certainly not; for even if it were positively known in what language it first appeared, the original is lost, itself a weighty argument against its inspiration. And if we had the original it would prove nothing, because we are not required to accept as canonical every ancient book of a religious character which was written by the Jews. The book may have been, and probably was, written first in a Shemitic dialect, Hebrew or Chaldee, but this admission, we repeat, proves nothing as to its inspiration.

Perhaps it will be said that the book of Tobit finds a place in the Septuagint Version. But did it originally form a part of it? and if it did, are we bound to accept, as inspired, all the Seventy thought proper to translate? It is not necessary to suppose that even the translators themselves regarded it as anything more than one of the religious books read among the Jews. And suppose they did, nothing is gained, for two reasons:

¹ According to the Greek, the elder Tobit died at the age of 158, the younger Tobit at the age of 127 years.

first, that the Romish Church does not follow the Septuagint text or texts; and, secondly, because it authoritatively repudiates some of the books found both in that version and in the Vulgate.

We ask, then, did the Jews receive Tobit as a canonical book? No. Josephus gives us a list of the books which were accepted as divine by his countrymen, and Tobit is not only excluded from it, but never named by him. All the evidence which we have from Jewish sources, condemns the reception of this book into the canon. Jerome himself, in his preface to the book, expressly affirms that the Jews did not receive it.

We now come to the Christian Church. Here two facts at once meet us. 1. That Tobit is quoted, or referred to, by not merely the later but the earlier fathers. 2. That it was early translated and circulated along with the books universally recognized.^m As to the first, we observe that no quotation, nor any number of quotations from a book, prove it to be inspired, or even that those who used it thought it so. But suppose any of the fathers thought it inspired, might they not err in this as in other matters of fact? The occurrence of it, along with many of the translations, shews only that it was a popular religious book. It is far more important for us to have distinct utterances upon the subject, and we have them in various forms. 1. Lists of the books of the Old Testament in which Tobit is not introduced. 2. Statements of its apocryphal character.

Lists of inspired books are of two kinds, those by individuals, and those by councils. We shall see what they say about Tobit.

The Canon of Melito. Tobit is not even mentioned.

The Canon of Origen. Tobit is not included.

The Council of Laodicea is said to have left a Canon, but it does not enumerate Tobit.

The Canon of the Apostolical Constitutions omits Tobit.

The Canon of Cyril (A.D. 348) is silent in reference to Tobit.

The Canon of Gregory Nazianzen excludes Tobit.

The Canon of Athanasius leaves out Tobit.

The Synopsis of Sacred Scripture warns us against the book of Tobit by name, as uncanonical.

The Canon of Epiphanius says nothing of Tobit, but his arrangement excludes it.

The Canon of Hilary of Poitiers (A.D. 354) does not include the book of Tobit.

The Canon of Hippo reckons Tobit as canonical, but in such

^m The principal ancient versions known are two in Greek, two in Latin—the Itala and the Vulgate; one in Syriac, and others in Arabic, Georgic, Ethiopic, Slavonic and Persian. The Chaldee is unknown; but two Hebrew translations, neither of them very ancient, have been published.

a way that the list in which it is inserted is referred to foreign churches for approval, with special regard to that of Rome.

The Canon of Jerome expressly excludes Tobit, and he declares that he only translated the book at the earnest request of his friends.

Additional evidence is at our command, but it is needless to go further in our inquiries. Out of twelve lists which have come down to us, ending with that of Jerome, only *two* include the book of Tobit. All those prior to the end of the fourth century exclude it, except the Council of Hippo, which claims the unenviable distinction of having first assigned it a place among the inspired books of the sacred canon."

We might pursue our investigations, and ask to what extent the book employed the pens of commentators, and furnished the texts of sermons. We should meet with the same kind of evidence, and find that scarcely a commentator or a preacher used it as a text-book. The allegorical exposition of Bede is among the first.

We cannot close, without adverting again to the extraordinary discrepancies which occur in the various translations. These discrepancies are of every possible kind, and clearly prove that the text is in such a state that no version can be depended upon as fairly representing the original.

This being the case, we arrive at the inevitable conclusion that the value of the book is no more than attaches to any composition which contains pure precepts of morality and incentives to piety. Its internal character forbids our admission of it either as a true history, or a sacred allegory. Its statements receive little or no confirmation from the records of the times, to which in some cases they are opposed. And, lastly, it has been always rejected by the Jews, and was refused by the earliest and purest ages of the Christian Church. That the Council of Trent received it in Jerome's defective version, could only be because it favours some of the least defensible errors of the Romish Church. No wonder that Protestants refuse to admit its claim, and give it no higher place than its merits justify.

B. H. C.

" It was long ere this example was followed generally, as we might shew by an appeal to subsequent authorities.

CORRESPONDENCE.

. The Editor begs the reader will bear in mind that he does not hold himself responsible for the opinions of his Correspondents.

DR. DAVIDSON AND THE REV. HARTWELL HORNE'S
INTRODUCTION TO THE HOLY SCRIPTURES.

To the Editor of "The Journal of Sacred Literature."

DEAR SIR,—I trust that the following remarks on a subject deeply affecting the interests of Biblical criticism and interpretation will not be thought unsuitable to the objects contemplated by *The Journal of Sacred Literature*.

I am, dear Sir,

Your's faithfully,

Carmarthen College.

T. N.

[We comply with this request, on the understanding that we do not hold ourselves responsible for all the statements of our correspondent. On the necessity of boldly opposing an ignorant and bigotted dogmatism in relation to biblical research, we entertain no more doubt than we do of the danger of unlicensed speculation in divine things.—Ed. *J. S. L.*]

THE pamphlet noted below^a is one whose character and whose occasion must be considered as somewhat unique. Our care for the interests of sacred science, and for the reputation of biblical scholars, compels us, despite our dislike of intermeddling in matters controversial, to notice it, and to present our readers with an impartial view of the questions involved.

The occasion of its appearance, though already widely known, must be briefly stated. Horne's *Introduction*, after passing through nine editions, was found by its publishers and proprietors, as also by the well-informed in such matters among the public, to fall far short of what a work of such pretensions should be in the present advanced state of biblical science. The enterprising publishers, therefore, resolved to bring forth a new edition, and employ, in conjunction with Mr. Horne, some biblical scholar of eminence, in its preparation. Dr. Davidson undertook to "re-write" the second volume, which is on the Old Testament; and by his recommendation—for we assume that on this there is

^a *Facts, Statements and Explanations*, connected with the publication of the Second Volume of the Tenth Edition of Horne's *Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*, etc., etc. By Samuel Davidson, D.D. London: Longmans and Co. 1857.

now no question—Dr. Tregelles was engaged to edit the fourth, on the New Testament. Mr. Horne himself was to revise the first and third. Dr. Davidson's account of the arrangement stands thus:—

"The publishers, whose property it is, after asking my opinion in two long letters respecting the manner in which the work should be remodelled and re-arranged, and receiving my sentiments on the subject, very unexpectedly asked me to revise the second and fourth volumes. But I declined to revise any part. I was then requested to *re-write* the volumes, when I engaged to furnish vol. ii. entirely new; but as I had so lately written on the New Testament, I declined to undertake vol. iv. with it, and recommended Dr. Tregelles, who was accordingly asked."—*Facts*, etc., p. 41.

To guard against "accidental discrepancies" in a work to be thus completed by divers hands, the publishers very properly said, in a letter to Dr. Davidson,

"It has appeared to Mr. Horne and to ourselves most desirable that all the editors should see the proofs of the whole work, in order to prevent any want of harmony between the several portions, and also to give mutual opportunities of making suggestions for the benefit of the work."—*Facts*, etc., p. 42.

Accordingly the proof sheets of each editor passed successively under the eyes of the others. It does not appear, we must say, that, during the process of printing, either Mr. Horne or Dr. Tregelles instituted any decided and serious protest against the views advanced by Dr. Davidson on the great subjects which have been mixed up with the controversy which has ensued, viz., inspiration, the authority of certain books of Scripture, and the doctrines termed evangelical. Indeed, as to the right of the editors to interfere in matters of opinion, Dr. Davidson declares,

"Both had as much to do with me in regard to authority and prerogative as I had to do with them; that is, *nothing whatever*. All that was stipulated in the legal contract was that each should look over and revise the proof-sheets of the whole work, so that there might be no 'accidental discrepancies.'"—p. 45.

We must confess, therefore, that we cannot see the justness of the language used by Mr. Horne and Dr. Tregelles, when, as soon as the edition was launched into the market, they severally wrote to the public papers in a strain of sorrowful protest against the sentiments advanced by Dr. Davidson in his part of the work, as "*wholly unknown*" to them. But, leaving our readers to judge for themselves, after the perusal of this pamphlet, of the questions at issue between the co-editors, we have now simply to state that these unfriendly declarations, put forth with every appearance of concern for the safety of the truth, served to call up such a storm of denunciation against Dr. Davidson as even the evil genius of the *odium theologicum* has seldom been able to rejoice in. In our land there is a grievous scandal in the shape of a "religious press"—noisy and frothy hebdomadal prints and washy monthly "magazines"—professing to represent coteries of evangelical opinion in and out of the National Church. These, suited for the illiterate, are best conducted by scribes whose chief characteristics are, a sparing culture, shallow sanctimoniousness, and inflated verbosity. They have ever a keen scent to discover any freshness or originality in the treatment of biblical questions, and a hoarse bark of alarm whenever the results of learning seem to loosen a stone in the long-ago finished edifice of their creed. The

religious sects are much at the mercy of these gentlemen of the "religious press"—becoming, we fear, more and more so. Hence, in part, the jealousy manifested towards all bold and independent thinking, and the suspicious looks cast towards those seats of learning where biblical literature and the higher branches of philosophy are studied under the auspices of modern scholarship. Hence the periodical onslaught on such men as Pye Smith, Dr. Arnold, Bishop Hampden, and Davidson. Hence such fanatic and tumultuous uproar as that recently raised on the appearance of that very ordinary book of poetic effusions, the *Rivulet*. We cannot express with sufficient intensity our condemnation of these trashy would-be leaders of the religious public. Of two or three of them especially we are bound to say that they are positive nuisances, held up apparently simply by the unlovely interest that ever clings around dogmatism and bigotry. Whenever they touch questions of erudition, it is only to utter caveats against the overweening pride of learning, and the dangers of reason and philosophy—dangers, by the way, to which they have never been exposed. The zeal they discover for religion appears to us to be, not unfrequently, shockingly irreligious. Their defence of truth is, in instances of not rare occurrence, unscrupulously mendacious. If we have come to understand what Christianity means, we hesitate not for a moment to say, that the portion of the "religious press" alluded to, presents, in the temper of its discussions, in its gross personalities, its bitterness and malicious disingenuousness, a most shameful caricature of it.

But why do we bend the bow on so sorry a quarry? Because, hither we must look, spite of some disavowals, for the "getters up" of the case against Dr. Davidson. Under the direction of turgid alarm-giving newspaper articles, printed off and distributed secretly among the constituency of the institution, the authorities of the Lancashire College proceeded to purge themselves of a putative heresiarch. A pressure was applied, which eventually commanded a bare majority of *two* against the professor. Of Nonconformist college committees much has been said. It is neither our function nor our desire to examine into the constitution of such a body: all constituencies have a right to manage their own affairs as they think best. But it is impossible not to reflect, and ask, If colleges are to be managed by committees, of what sort of elements ought such committees to be constituted? If the appointment and removal of professors, judging of the consistency of a professor's creed with the recognized code of doctrine, weighing in an even balance the value of his conclusions on difficult points of criticism, determining where enquiry should end, and induction from indisputable phenomena in the antecedents, say of a portion of Holy Writ, should be declared unallowable,—if all this and much more is to rest with committees, of what kind of men ought committees to be composed? We agree on the necessity of watchfulness, lest the chairs of ministerial seminaries should be taken possession of by men who would poison the stream at its spring; but for this very reason we still more closely press our question.

It is right here to remark that a sub-committee was appointed to examine Dr. Davidson's volume, and report in due time their finding; that this sub-committee, at whose head was a gentleman of ripe scholar-

ship, entered on their work like men who felt the gravity of their undertaking, and presented an elaborate report; and that, in consequence of a recommendation contained in this report, and adopted by the committee, Dr. Davidson prepared the pamphlet of "*Facts, etc.*," at the head of this Article. The concluding paragraph of the sub-committee's report was as follows:—

"Our unanimous recommendation is, that this committee earnestly request Dr. Davidson to prepare, as speedily as may be consistent with due care in the revision, such an explanation of the parts of his recent work which are deemed objectionable as may remove misunderstanding which his language may have occasioned, conciliate opposition which his haste may have provoked, make concessions where it may be justly due, and so take the best means of vindicating himself *from unjust and malevolent assertions.*"

The report, which thus closed, having been fully discussed, the committee passed, *nem con.*, the following resolution—a remarkable resolution enough, if the subsequent one of "want of confidence" was according to truth and justice! Singularly enough also, as his Nemesis would have it, Mr. Kelly was the seconder of the one, and also the mover of the other!

"That while this committee expresses its *continued confidence in the general soundness of Dr. Davidson's theological views*, its appreciation of the value of his services to the college, and its regard for him personally, it is still of opinion that explanations of several parts of his recent work are due to the constituents of the college, on account of the incautious language he has there employed," etc.

We involuntarily ask ourselves, Was this resolution passed after the appearance and systematic examination of the obnoxious volume? What then had the effect of bringing to pass a resolution diametrically opposite to it soon after? Nothing from Dr. Davidson saw the light in the interval, save the pamphlet required—a document which, in the estimation of most people, is eminently calm and conciliating, dignified and frank in concession, Christian in temper, and unfolding no new doctrine. Did *this* form the basis of the new resolution? Nothing of the sort! it only failed to "remove great doubt and uncertainty . . . on matters of essential importance, etc." Who but exclaims here, Has the "continued confidence" expressed in yesterday's resolution degenerated into the "great doubt and uncertainty" of that of to-day? As those who wish simply to serve the truth, we aver that the two resolutions, the material part of the latter of which we now proceed to record, appear to us *painfully discrepant*; and we ask, Is the latter according to *justice* if the former is according to *truth*, and *vice versa*?

. . . . "This committee are constrained, with deep regret, to declare that, without questioning the sincerity of his (Dr. Davidson's) professions, these explanations [in the pamphlet] are in their judgment, far from satisfactory; that while several *material concessions* have been made, and *misapprehensions removed from some points*, yet in the main the most formidable objections are rather passed over than fairly met, and *great doubt and uncertainty* at least left on matters of *essential importance*: it is therefore their painful duty to state that, on the ground of these grave faults and the rashness which he still exhibits in dealing with divine truth, their confidence in him as a professor in this institution is greatly shaken, and that they view with serious apprehension the effect of his teaching and influence on the students committed to his care."

We are completely bewildered. Here is a man in whom the committee have "continued confidence" in respect to the general soundness of his "theological views," blamed, notwithstanding, for not removing "formidable objections" and "great doubt and uncertainty on matters of essential importance,"—a man who, in the estimation of the same persons, is both worthy of their "continued confidence" and also of having their "confidence in him as a professor greatly shaken,"—and here is a company of gentlemen who have "continued confidence" in the general soundness of his theological views, appreciate "the value of his services to the college," and "cherish regard for him personally," and who also "view with serious apprehension the effect of his teaching on the students committed to his care!" The former class of terms was adopted by the whole committee; the latter, it is a relief to say, was engrossed only by a majority of *two*.

As the adverse resolution was so studiously worded as to avoid any direct charge against the doctor, it was natural that a care for his reputation should urge him to request from the committee the *grounds* of their disaffection definitely stated. He therefore wrote as follows:—

"Gentlemen,—I have received a resolution passed by you at your meeting of the 10th June (1857). It does not state the grounds on which it is based, being couched in vague terms of indefinite import, affirming nothing positive on which your judgment therein recorded is founded, but leaving the most unjust and injurious conclusions to be drawn respecting me.

"I therefore require in writing the precise grounds on which the clauses of the resolution are based, believing that those who profess to be actuated by justice, truth, and fairness, will not refuse to state explicitly the reasons which have led them to their conclusion.

"SAMUEL DAVIDSON."

The committee deemed it the wiser course to decline giving "reasons." And thus the doctor had to vacate his chair, bearing in one hand resolution No. I.—of "continued confidence;" in the other, resolution No. II.—of "confidence greatly shaken," and that after "material concessions," etc., had been made.

Now it strikes us as strange in the extreme that measure of this kind towards a learned, and, as we think we shall by and by shew, an orthodox man, should have been dealt out amongst Independents. Right justly, we gladly admit it, have they always claimed for themselves a respectable character for culture and erudition. Side by side with orthodox doctrine they have never failed to forward sound learning. Neither is it to be forgotten on an occasion so extraordinary as the present, that their boast has been, that their adherence to right doctrine has resulted in great measure from a scrupulous tolerance of opinion. They are never backward in maintaining the ineffectiveness for good of creeds and standards, and in disavowing the prevalence among themselves either virtually or actually of "subscription." The more intelligent in their ranks will say that subscription leads to reserve, offers a premium to dishonesty, is inconsistent with the free play of individual conscience and judgment, ever degenerates into formality,—in a word, is either a sign of, or an instrument securing, the absence of a vital and genuine faith. We feel

called upon to hold up these professions of a respectable body, and contrast them with the proceedings which have led to the retirement of Dr. Davidson from the Lancashire Independent College.

Furthermore, the congregational body places no small value on the great Protestant principle of the right of private judgment in things religious. That principle secures to every man immunity against any let or hindrance in judging of the meaning of Scripture, and embracing or rejecting articles of doctrine. Of course, anticipating objections, we are aware that every society must be formed on a basis of concurrent views, and those who are members of any religious body must of necessity have become so from sympathy felt in the creed and objects, as far as known, of that body. But surely concurrence in the main principles, the essential doctrines—such concurrence as will command the “confidence” of the body in “the general soundness” of each of its members in his “theological views”—is all that *can be*, is all that usually *is*, expected. It were an intolerable embargo on conscience to require that in every minute particular of opinion and practice, every member of a body should precisely coincide with every other, or even with the general voice of that body. What then is the general creed of the Independents? It may in general terms be described as *evangelical*. Their colleges are conducted on this understanding. The trust-deeds of these institutions usually recognize the doctrines termed *evangelical*. Men holding evangelical doctrines are naturally sought as professors. Dr. Davidson, on this understanding, was chosen to the Lancashire College. It comes therefore to be a question of some interest, whether, by a renunciation of evangelical doctrine, or, in other words, by propounding advisedly opinions which are inconsistent with evangelical Christianity, he has justly exposed himself to the penalty of removal from the honourable post which for fourteen years he had so efficiently occupied. We propose calmly, in the interest of truth and justice, of Christian learning and religious liberty, and with no wish whatever to interfere with the decisions of any man or body of men, to examine into this question. To the cause of biblical literature in this country, it must of course be of vast importance that men of piety and learning, who are employed with the difficulties of criticism and exegesis, should be shielded from the attacks of immoderate and ignorant, or of narrow-minded and bigotted men, who, by violence and clamour, strive to bear down before them whatsoever happens to be contrary to their own prejudices. *The Journal of Sacred Literature* is itself a fellow-sufferer in this worthy cause; and the longer we live, and the more we become acquainted with the demands and the dangers of sacred learning, the more ardently anxious do we become to do our part in its lofty service.

Now if Dr. Davidson can be proved not to have rejected the truths of revelation, but to have transgressed simply against loose and undefined notions about inspiration, the interpretation of divers passages of Scripture, the authority and authorship of certain books, etc., then the storm raised against him resolves itself into a mere veto upon biblical science, and freedom of enquiry into the meaning and condition of Holy Writ. Substantially, we believe this to be the true account of the matter.

First, then, as to *inspiration*. Where, we ask, is the formula adopted

by evangelical believers on this mysterious subject? Some persons, greatly venturesome, or greatly ignorant, say this question has long ago been settled, and requires no discussion. Where then is the "standard?" Where the definition which all recognize? Nothing of the kind exists. We dare affirm that the code of doctrine generally received in the "orthodox" churches contains no declaration as to what is meant by inspiration. So beset with difficulty is the subject, and so indefinitely left in many of its aspects by the biblical writers themselves, that the Church has wisely refrained of late from definition, and contented itself with general statements. Individual authors and individual Churches have gone farther, maintaining with unreasonable stringency the equally divine origin of every part of the record—not excepting the alphabetic characters and punctuation; and these apologists, however pitiaibly credulous, deserve credit at least for a bold consistency: they endeavour to fortify popular phraseology, as the framers of the *Formula Consensus Helveticæ* did, by a kind of ratiocination. But as the Lutherans in that age of Bible-defence and culture immediately succeeding the Reformation, abstained from pronouncing definitively in their symbols; so the Churches of our country, with a respect equally profound for the Word of God, have likewise done. Adhesion to any form of words of man's device on this subject has never been made a condition of membership in any Church, nor of admission into any ministry. The Church Catholic—the Independent body included—has ever maintained, rightly and safely, that the Scriptures contain the Word of God, and are therefore, as the *rule of faith and practice*, of *infallible authority*. But it has never been able to demonstrate, nor has the cultured and reflecting portion of it ever been able to believe, that everything contained in the Bible is divinely inspired, or is of any less importance in its place and for its purpose, for not having been inspired. What, for instance, of catalogues of names taken from the Jewish Registers? What of incorrect historical references? What of diversities in the Evangelists' reports of the same discourses of our Lord?

If then it be true that no authoritative formula exists either in the National Church or in the different sections of the Nonconformist bodies of our land, but men have been satisfied with general phraseology, against what rule has Dr. Davidson transgressed?

But what is it that Dr. Davidson has taught on the subject of inspiration? Has he *denied*, or *maintained*, the positive inspiration of the Bible? Has he taught anything more startling, or novel, than has been taught by English divines before him? Nay, we will ask, has he taught anything more liberal, or *dangerous*—a word of frequent use with the alarmists in this controversy—than men of high standing for piety and erudition in his own body have taught? We answer, Nothing! We are not aware that the obnoxious volume contains anything more "rationalistic," or more "reckless," than the following, written by that singularly acute man, the venerated pastor of the Pilgrim Fathers, and father of Independency—*John Robinson*.

"Neither all things which the prophets of God wrote were written by divine inspiration, but some of them humanly, as their human affairs, common to them with other men, required; neither was all wherein they were divinely inspired, brought

into the public treasury of the Church, or made part of the Canonical Scriptures, which we call the Bible ; no more than all which they spoke was spoken by the spirit ; or all which they spoke by the spirit, written, John xx. 31 ; xxi. 25 ; but only so much as the Lord, in wisdom and mercy, thought requisite to guide the Church in faith and obedience to the world's end," etc.^b

We have surface men in our day in all sections of the Church, who would pronounce this downright heresy. And yet John Robinson's name and principles are cherished, and not an iota of his writings is condemned by the Congregational Churches.

Of the two more commonly received theories—*theories* they are, let us remember, as much as Dr. Davidson's—the *verbal* and the *plenary*, possibly the latter is the less open to objection. The former maintains that all the words of Scripture and their arrangement, the form as well as the substance of Scripture, were a direct and determinate gift of the divine Spirit to the writers. Probably, many of Dr. Davidson's brethren, his accusing brethren, hold this. The latter theory represents the writers as so influenced that all they communicated was entirely free from every species of error. Many of the Doctor's brethren, again, symbolize with this. Dr. Davidson, according to his own distinct averment, holds it likewise. Since, however, it amounts to but a *theory*, and not to a demonstration, nor a revelation, nor yet to an article of creed imposed upon him by his co-religionists, he rightly exercises his judgment in searching how far, in the face of irrefragable evidence presented by the sacred writings themselves, he can go along with it, as commonly expressed. He uses discrimination ; reverently examines ; and concludes that in all matters *moral* and *religious*—in all things touching on *faith* and *practice*—the sacred writers are indubitably correct and infallible ; but that in matters of physical science, chronology, etc., they were, like other men, subject to occasional inaccuracies. It is to be remembered that he has not written systematically on the subject. In page 82 of this pamphlet, he observes, " It so happens that I have not *discussed* it. I have not even attempted to give a *definition* of it. I have merely glanced at it in passing, in order to make my treatise on interpretation more complete." The pith of what he *has* said, and which has given occasion for such intemperate and "reckless" denunciations, is found in his volume, p. 372.

" If, as we have just seen, there was an accommodation on the part of the writers to the ideas of their times respecting the objects of nature, the possibility of their not being so far enlightened or inspired as to have correct infallible knowledge on points of natural science, on chronology, archæology, geography, etc., suggests itself to the reflecting mind. It may be asked, Why extend their inspiration of correctness beyond what is properly *religious* and *moral truth* ? Why not suppose that their knowledge of the subjects, to which we have been adverting as secondary sources, was not always perfect or accurate—that they were " led into " *religious*, not *natural* truth ? The mission and office of the writers was a religious one. They were the media employed of God to make known his will to men :—respecting his nature ; his mode of dealing with his responsible creatures on this earth ; their conditions, duties, and hopes, as immortal beings. They wrote to shew, in various ways, what the

^b See the valuable edition of the works of John Robinson, with an interesting Life, etc., by the Rev. Robert Ashton. Lond. 1851. Vol. i., p. 44.

history of the human race has been in relation to God, the Creator, the Ruler, and loving Parent. All their communications bore upon Messiah and his salvation—the only begotten Son of the Father, in his humiliation, functions, and exaltation. They were *religious* and *moral* teachers. But they were not teachers of geography, astronomy, botany, physiology, or history. Their commission did not extend so far.”

In the pamphlet of *Facts*, etc., after presenting quotations from celebrated orthodox divines who have maintained views substantially identical with his own, including Baxter, Howe, Parry of Wymondley, Bishop Heber, Dr. Pye Smith, Alford, etc. (pp. 53—79), he observes:—

“It has been matter of agreeable surprize to myself to find so many distinguished writers substantially coinciding with me on the subject of inspiration. I did not know their sentiments before.. The fact shews that the same result may be arrived at independently by many inquirers. I have quoted *their* testimony as likely to carry weight in quarters where prejudice will not allow *my* views to be received. Perhaps persons who do not shut their eyes to opinions *from all quarters*, will accept my view of inspiration when it is enunciated by a host of theological authors who stand pre-eminent in the eyes of the reading public; Warburton, Arnold, Whately, Heber, Hinds (Bishop), Baxter, Howe, Thomas Scott, the two Conybeares, Alford, and Pye Smith. Or if they do not *accept* it, they may at least begin to doubt the certainty of their own judgment, inasmuch as it is arrayed against some talent, learning, thoughtfulness, and piety.”

Dr. Davidson was mistaken! Neither the reason, nor the gentle half-concealed satire of this passage, had any effect on the gentlemen who were the “triers” of his “orthodoxy.” The alarm excited by the verbal inspirationists was too strong. Dr. Davidson, like Dr. Pye Smith before him, erred in yielding to evidence, and in assuming that the Bible was sufficiently fortified by *real*, without the aid of *fictitious* arguments. He made a mistake by supposing that his knowledge could be a worthy match to ignorance—that his *faith*, based on a clear apprehension of incorrupt evidence, and on a happy experience of the power of God’s word, could be at all comparable to the hazy *notions* of traditionalism. Although in his volume he had only advocated views on inspiration identical with those of Baxter (in one part of his writings at least—it has been said that in others he vacillates), Howe, Whately, and Pye Smith, and although the mover of the adverse resolution has since declared in print, that he is “disposed to believe that his (Dr. Davidson’s) views of divine truth are *far more evangelical* than his own volume would indicate,” yet the resolution was passed, and the Professor was forced to succumb. For the satisfaction of our readers we will give a brief extract or two, shewing the views held by some of the divines referred to.

“‘All Scripture,’ writes St. Paul . . . ‘is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness.’ In other words: to *religious* instruction, of whatever kind, is confined the scriptural character of Scripture, the *agency of the Holy Spirit*. It is not, therefore, truth of all kinds that the *Bible* was *inspired to teach*, but only such truth as tends to religious edification; and the Bible is, consequently, infallible as far as regards this, and this alone.”^c

“I regard, as inspired Scripture, all that refers to *holy things*, all that can bear

^c Bishop Hinds on *The Inspiration and Authority of Scripture*.

the character of 'oracles of God,' and admit the rest as appendages of the nature of private memoirs or public records, useful to the antiquary and philologist, but which belong not to the rule of faith or the directory of practice. . . . In other words : the quality of inspiration, forming the ground of faith and obedience, inheres in every sentence, paragraph, or book, which, either directly, or by implication, contains religious truth, precept, or expectation. . . . Inspiration belongs to RELIGIOUS objects ; and to attach it to other things is to lose sight of its nature and misapply its designs." ^d

Again :—

"If the view that the range of inspiration, that *its proper and sole reference is to religious subjects* be rejected, it will inevitably follow that we must impute error to the Spirit of God. Abhorred be the thought ! We must suppose to be physically correct those declarations concerning the astral worlds, the phenomena of the atmosphere, and the human frame, which have been mentioned : we must regard the inferior creatures as 'made to be taken and destroyed,' in defiance of all our knowledge that the whole animal creation is formed for an immense variety of beneficent purposes, partly, no doubt, unknown to us, but in a very great measure manifest by the clearest and most beautiful proofs." ^e

"The belief in the plenary inspiration of Scripture—and the consequent belief in its complete and universal infallibility, not only on *religious*, but also on *historical* and *philosophical points*—these notions, which prevail among a large portion of Christians, are probably encouraged, or connived at, by very many of those who do not, or at least *did* not originally, in their own hearts, entertain any such belief. But they dread 'the unsettling of men's minds ;' they fear that they would be unable to distinguish *what is*, and *what is not*, *matter of inspiration* ; and, consequently, that their reverence for Scripture, and for religion altogether, would be totally destroyed ; while, on the other hand, the error they urge is very harmless, leading to no practical evil, but rather to piety of life." ^f

Again :—

"In points unconnected with *religion*, such as the directions St. Paul gives about bringing his cloak and his books from Troas, as it would be absurd to suppose *any inspiration*, so there was no need that he should disavow it. And this applies to such purely *historical* passages in the sacred writers as involve no *religious doctrine* or *precept*," etc. ^g

"There are certain minor points of accuracy or inaccuracy, of which human research suffices to inform men, and on which, from want of that research, it is often the practice to speak vaguely and inexactly. Such are sometimes the conventionally received distances from place to place ; such are the common account of phenomena in natural history, etc. Now, in matters of this kind, the evangelists and apostles were not supernaturally informed, but left, in common with others, to the guidance of their natural faculties." ^h

An eminently learned and acute prelate has said,—

"As the more rigid theory of inspiration was abandoned by the learned, on account of the insuperable difficulties opposed to it by the discrepancies found in the gospels ; so these same discrepancies compel us to admit, that the superintending control of the Spirit was not exerted to exempt the sacred writers altogether from errors and inadvertencies." ⁱ

^d Dr. Pye Smith, *Congregational Magazine*, July, 1837. p. 422.

^e Dr. Pye Smith, *Scripture and Geology*.

^f Archbishop Whately : *Essays on some Difficulties in the Writings of the Apostle Paul*. Essay i.

^g *Ibid.* Essay ix.

^h Dean Alford : *New Testament*, vol. i., p. 19. Third Edition.

ⁱ *Translation of Schleiermacher on St. Luke* : Introduction, p. 15.

Referring to the pamphlet for further citations, we may now be permitted to quote, finally, one or two passages from a recent publication embodying the same sentiments as those advocated by Dr. Davidson.

"On no question, probably, have undoubtedly good men more differed, than on the nature and degrees of inspiration, and hitherto they have been able to do so without their orthodoxy being suspected; for in the doctrinal standards of the Church of England, and most other Churches, general statements have been employed which allow of great latitude of opinion. It may be stated, briefly, that for fifteen centuries the doctrine of the Church on inspiration was, that the sacred writers were moved by the Holy Ghost to teach Christianity, and that their writings thus possessed full *authority*; but it laid down no *theory*, nor denied a human element in the Bible, and, as a consequence, allowed of circumstantial fallibility." "I believe my own views of inspiration are higher than those of many writers of the present day; but so long as those writers, or any others, admit the *divine* authority of the Bible in matters of faith and practice, I feel I have no right to question their orthodoxy, their piety, their usefulness. . . . If any Christian brother admits that *the Bible teaches a religion which only God could reveal, and in a manner which only the Holy Ghost could point out*, he holds all that I have a right to demand, although he may think verbal inspiration a human folly, and greatly modify that which is called plenary. . . Surely if every doctrine, every precept, and every prophecy, found in the gospels and epistles, are thoroughly believed as indited under the promised aid of the Holy Ghost, a foundation is laid for the defence of Christianity against all enemies and gainsayers, to which an assertion of the entire truth of every circumstantial statement and fact would add very little strength indeed."

To him who cannot see the reasonableness and soundness of words like these, and who will not endeavour to comprehend the grounds on which men like those we have above quoted have come to their conclusions, we cannot here loiter to have much to say.

Great odium has been cast on Dr. Davidson in connexion with other questions besides inspiration. Into these points it is not our purpose at any length to enter at present. But one or two remarks by the way.^k The learned professor's mode of dealing with the Pentateuch has been greatly objected to. Dr. Tregelles, in one of his letters to Dr. Davidson during the process of preparing their different contributions, says, "I did not expect to find a reference to *Elohim documents* and other theories of that school." And why not? Surely this non-expectancy did not, with Dr. Tregelles, arise from non-acquaintance with the posture of critical debate on the subject. He is not the man not to know that able scholars have long contested the point, and presented at least the appearance of a good case,—Stähelin, De Wette, etc., in favour of two; Hupfeld in favour of three original documents; while Hengstenberg, Drechsler, Hävernicks, and Keil are against them. Would it be for the credit of this branch of literature in our country for a new Introduction to the Old Testament to appear which ignored altogether, that is, made itself appear entirely ignorant of, so weighty a discussion? We opine

^j *The Bible and Lord Shaftesbury: A Letter*, etc. By the Rev. Henry Burgess, LL.D., Ph.D., pp. 30, 36—38. See also, pp. 39—41.

^k The charge of "plagiarism" we dismiss with one word. The volume is to a great extent a *résumé* of opinions, and these, with references to the authors, are often stated in the author's own words. And who does not see that the sagacious detectors of "piracies" have been led to the plundered quarters by the doctor's own hand, in his references! Most fortunate "detectives," to have such a guide!

not. The time also is too far past for the Scriptures to be defended on the protective principle. And they need it not. An open field and untrammelled liberty the Bible must henceforth have. It fears no open attack, but it fears, not without reason, the defence of cowards. It can afford to drop all factitious honours which the patronizing care of mistaken friends have heaped upon it, and in its unsophisticated simplicity, and by its own power, stand in the van of the Church Catholic, to fight the battles of humanity. We must say, therefore, though doubtless differing from some of Dr. Davidson's conclusions, that we admire the fidelity, courage, and judicial candour he has evinced in his treatment of the Pentateuch. In yielding to the force of what appeared to him evidence, he has in some things departed from commonly-received opinions. He favours the view that Moses was not the author of the whole of the five books. He leans to the acknowledgment of two original documents from which the Pentateuch was compiled—to which the names of *Elohim* and *Jehovah documents*¹ have been given, by reason of the supposed prevalence in them respectively of these names of the Supreme. But in so doing he violates no article of faith, casts dishonour on no moral precept, weakens in no sense the religious force of God's Word. He has simply adopted one side of an open question.

Indeed, amid the many perplexing speculations he has had to notice, he gives clear evidence, it appears to us, of attachment to conservative principles of criticism. Merely as brief examples, we may refer to pp. 581 and 587 of the volume. In the former, the endeavour to fasten a mythic character on the Book of Exodus in its account of the plagues, the pillar of cloud and fire, the passage of the Red Sea, etc., is thus remarked upon. "But such assumptions require to be sustained by evidence before they be entitled to reception. The exaggerations and creations of tradition may *possibly* be in portions here and there, but *probability* is against them. It is much safer and more natural to understand the narratives in their plain historical sense, leaving miracles and wonders to remain as they are, since they are appropriate and worthy of the Deity in a scheme of human redemption, essentially supernatural." In the latter, he is dealing with the same mythic theory in relation to the Book of Numbers. "Rationalistic criticism has assigned a mythic character to many parts of the book before us. Narratives like the history of Balaam, the rebellion of the sons of Korah, etc., have been suspected of bearing that colouring. The repetition of the events connected with the manna and the quails has also appeared to imply that the facts lie at the basis, one account being merely a corrupt version of the other. But such conjectures are wild and wayward. It is better to abide by the plain historical nature of the book as it stands." The volume abounds in passages of this sober and conservative character; but they are all carefully overlooked by the "orthodox" men who sit in judgment: not one of them is quoted.

¹ We have seen one or two exclamations of pious horror at the familiarity with the divine name supposed to be indicated by these epithets, as if they were used in a light and profane way. Do not these good people who are so shocked use the term "Christian," "God-like," "divine," etc., without irreverence?

The author has given great offence on points of *doctrine*. Into the charges we cannot enter at any length. The volume in Horne, our readers will bear in mind, is not a work on systematic theology, and no formal treatment was therefore to be expected on Christian doctrines subject to metaphysical debate. The work is scientifically confined to such general questions as are useful preparatory to exegesis, etc. But the author has not entirely shorn his work of theology. Here and there, when the working out of hermeneutical rules, etc., gives occasion, he touches and gives his opinion with a freedom which bespeaks a mind void of all suspicion, upon many points of doctrine. Through all these places he has been hunted with the pertinacity, and with not a little of the disingenuousness, of an intolerance worthy of Dominic or Alva, only that it makes itself, in some cases, truly ridiculous by "much ado about nothing."

Witness the outcry on the subject of the *Trinity*. Of this mystery of mysteries, it is said, Dr. Davidson uses language not sufficiently "clear and explicit." We know not the man who does, or who can; nor do we much admire the modesty of him who professes exactitude of terminology on so unfathomable a doctrine. The burden of Dr. Davidson's offence lies in his scruples about the term *person* as applied to the Father, Son, and Spirit, respectively. Here again we are not aware that among the Congregationalists, who all maintain the deity of Christ, this term *person* has been adopted as of divine authority. We have known many in that body who have uniformly objected to that term as a misleading one. But, it will be asked, if Dr. Davidson is inclined to reject this non-scriptural term,^m does he reject the *thing* intended? Nothing of the sort! He only modestly thinks that the word "distinction" would be better.ⁿ "My remarks are *not* in opposition to the distinction of persons in the Godhead . . . but are simply intended to shew that to speak of *distinct persons* gives a handle to objectors; and that it would be better, if possible, to lay aside the use of the term *person*, and speak only of *three eternal distinctions* in the Godhead."^o "Because I do not like the term *person* as so applied, the charge against me is, that I dislike the doctrine."^p Precisely so!

Now, though the Rev. J. Kelly, in a recent pamphlet, asserts that this term "person" is "indispensable, if one cares to express, with any measure of accuracy, the idea which is intended to be conveyed," we are able to announce that the term "distinction," favoured by Dr. Davidson, is the identical term used in the schedule of doctrine in the trust-deed of the Lancashire college. How was it that this material fact was passed unobserved? The professor is condemned for standing, so far, on the

^m Need it be said that the only place where it occurs in our version is Heb. i. 3. Here it is an inaccurate translation of *ὑπόστασις*. Thomas Scott renders it "subsistence," and says of Beza, who uses *persona*, that he does it "improperly." The term "person," then, is non-scriptural.

ⁿ We have much pleasure in referring our readers, on this point, to Dr. Wardlaw's newly-published *Lectures on Systematic Theology*, vol. ii., p. 3, where the sentiment maintained is identical with Dr. Davidson's.

^o *Facts, etc.*, p. 31.

^p *Ibid.*, p. 32.

doctrinal basis of his own college. Can the present jealous wardens of this institution allow the schedule to remain unpurged? The Rev. J. Kelly has laid it down that the term "person" is "indispensable;" but the schedule contains the term "distinction," as preferable to person,— "commonly called persons," being only added as explanatory, by reason of the prevailing usage.

To set at rest the question of Dr. Davidson's soundness on this point of doctrine, we make one more extract. It will be observed that he does not himself discard the use of the word "person."

"The doctrine of the Trinity is such [a doctrine of inference]. In no one place is it expressly asserted that the three persons are both equal and one. But inasmuch as the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are represented as divine in the highest sense, and as we know that there is but one God, we infer that the three are one. It does not follow, however, that a doctrine is less certain, because we infer it from Scripture statements. That of the Trinity is equally firm, though we draw one inference in educing it from Scripture."—pp. 478, 479.

It will fully serve our purpose, relative to other items of evangelical doctrine, to give a few brief passages fairly quoted from the volume and the pamphlet; all of which, if we mistake not, will bear out the assumption we have made that Dr. Davidson has not departed from the body of truth confessed to by the Church Catholic.

Original Sin.—"From Eph. ii. 3. Calvin deduces *this* doctrine of original sin—that 'we are born with sin as serpents bring their venom from the womb.' Such a view is contrary both to the analogy of faith, and to reason. The general tenor of Scripture shews man to be accountable to God. Here his responsibility is destroyed. As man is commanded to repent and believe, he has the *physical* ability to do so, ability being commensurate with obligation. Besides, reason teaches that *sin* can only be a transgression of known law. And with this the Bible coincides. Hence sin cannot properly be predicated of infants from their very birth. They do not bring sin along with them into the world as serpents bring their poison. They have in them an undeveloped *propensity*, which will naturally *lead to* sin. They have the germs of what afterwards becomes sinful and sin."—vol., p. 485. "Two births are [in John iii. 6] set over against one another. The Spirit is the author of the one; man is the instrumental cause of the other. The children born in the one are carnally minded, because those from whom they spring have a sinful nature: the children born in the other are holy, because the Spirit who produces their nature is holy."—*Ibid.*, p. 275.

The Doctor maintains that man, through the depravity of his nature, is *morally* unable, but *physically* able to perform what is right. For this also his inquisitors condemn; but most sensible men will approve.

Atonement.—"The fact itself (the sacrifice of Christ) is certain, because it is stated in so many texts widely distributed and harmonious,"—*ibid.*, p. 310. "The doctrine of the Atonement runs through the entire Bible as the great central truth which revelation was designed to announce and teach."—*Ibid.*, p. 477, see also, p. 504.

Christ in his Offices.—"The Messiah unites and completes in his own person the offices of prophet, priest, and king. These foreshadowed him under the Old Testament, preparing the minds of the believing Jews for one *greater than the prophets*, on whose law the isles should wait; *more than a priest*, in that he should offer up himself for a sacrifice; *higher than a king*, inasmuch as kings should tremble at his glory. The prophets, priests, and kings of the Old Testament were only three representations of One Person, who should be none such as they exclusively, and *yet all together*."—*Ibid.*, p. 866.

Regeneration and work of the Spirit.—Clear scriptural views on the need of renewal, and on the agency of the Holy Spirit in effecting it, have usually been considered as determinate of the general "orthodoxy" of a man's creed. Let the reader judge if Dr. Davidson is incorrupt here.

"John iii. 3: 'Except a man be born again,' etc. The nature of the change intended in these words of our Saviour is elucidated in the context, especially the 5th verse. 'Except a man be born of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God.' The change was one of a spiritual kind. It was purifying and renewing, as indicated by the expressions *water* and the *Spirit*, the one the Old Testament term, and the other the New, but both referring to renovation of heart. What was designated by the washing with water under the Jewish dispensation, was described as a change effected by the Spirit in the new dispensation. It is entirely contrary to the context, and indeed to the whole discourse of the Saviour with Nicodemus, to say with Bishop Terrot, that the phrase *born again* is here employed in the technical sense of Jewish theology, or as a familiar trope expressive of the change that took place in a proselyte from heathenism to Judaism."—p. 293.

In remarks on the well-known passage in Heb. vi. 4, "For it is impossible for those who were once enlightened," etc., whatever may be thought of the exposition given, the following language is highly satisfactory, as clearly teaching by implication the orthodox doctrine of the work of the Spirit. "Every unprejudiced reader recognizes in the description, 'It is impossible for those who were once enlightened,' etc., persons *truly enlightened and converted by the Holy Ghost.*"—*Ibid.*, p. 295.

Refer also to p. 275, on John iii. 6, quoted above—a passage, though brief, yet decisive enough. All men acquainted with the philosophy of evidence know that things *implied* in what is said or done are considered worthy of unusual attention, and that indirect and casual declarations oftentimes exhibit a man's opinion as surely as formal statements. Indeed they are not unfrequently taken as of far superior value, and that for a very obvious reason. Now, taking the class of evidence supplied thus by the *implied* and *casual* running through the entire of the author's volume, and connecting it with what there is of positive and formal statement (and of this there is more than in such a work might reasonably have been expected), we think there is proof enough afforded to banish all fear and anxiety from all minds not morbidly suspicious, or pitiably ignorant. It is quite natural to mention here the praises bestowed by the present arraigners on all the learned author's former works—in some of which, we beg to remind Dr. Tregelles, Mr. Horne, and others, the same doctrine of inspiration had been in substance, developed.

But to all this we must add Dr. Davidson's own clear avowal of evangelical opinion. We are accustomed to believe a Christian man on his word. One of the pamphleteers against our author has said, greatly to his own damage in our judgment, but in faithful keeping with the spirit which has presided over this controversy, "I never meet with a passage beginning with the phrases 'humbly submit' or 'humbly think,' or others of a like nature, without having my suspicion aroused." Concerning the temper of this gentleman's mind, much is taught here by implication. He might not be readily prepared to believe any man except on oath—not even then without a dash of hesitancy. But bidding to a distance this spirit, we cleave to the brotherhood who believe a Christian

man when he makes a serious statement. Now what does Dr. Davidson say? Goaded on by ungenerous suspicions, and audacious averments, he is led to make a confession of some prime articles of evangelical doctrine—a confession, we may well imagine, which he did not like to make, because he must have felt it to be entirely superfluous. But who can satisfy the awakened suspicions of those who strain at gnats?

“On all essential and vital matters,” he says,² “those constituting the evangelical system—the truths most surely believed among genuine Christians—the volume contains unmistakeable utterances of belief. Nothing in it will, in my opinion, be found to infringe on the completeness and sufficiency of Holy Scripture, as an unerring rule of faith and practice, man’s original depravity, regeneration by the Holy Spirit, justification by faith, the atonement made by the divine Redeemer for the sins of the world, and the application of it in redemption. Assuredly there was no intention to contravene any of these and *other necessarily-related* doctrines, whatever may have been hastily inferred from isolated and loose expressions. . . . Perhaps I may not agree with them (older divines) in every particular, but that does not prevent me from avowing my cordial attachment to the doctrines commonly termed evangelical. I have looked at them too long and often to be disturbed or troubled with the slightest doubt about their truth. They are an impregnable rock on which I hope to stand for ever myself; and whose safety to immortal souls I trust I shall ever commend to others. Christ, in all his excellency and offices as the Prophet, Priest, and King of his people, the only and all-sufficient Mediator—is the precious corner-stone of the believer,” etc.

And yet he was suspected! Neither passages like those we have quoted above, nor his own solemn avowal in so many definite and forcible words, could avail. We know not the secrets of Dr. Davidson’s heart, nor what faith he embraces which he has not made known. We simply note what he *has* made known, and believe it to be his faith, just as we believe what is the faith of any other man, or body of men when they profess it. Dr. Davidson, as an unprejudiced student of God’s truth, proceeding on the principle of receiving more light and altering judgments, may in future occupy a position in religious faith varying from the present. But, *as yet, so far as he has spoken*, he is *worthy of the confidence* of all enlightened evangelical Christians. Those who cast back his words as untrue, or act as if they did, assume a responsibility we should not love to undertake. But probably the Doctor may console himself in some such way as the banished Anaxagoras of Clazomenæ did: “It is not I who have lost the Athenians; it is the Athenians who have lost me.” Would that all “Athenians,” who usually ostracise the best of their servants, had wisdom enough to see their own folly!

The scope and value of Dr. Davidson’s volume may be judged of from the way in which it has been received by competent judges. We shall introduce two or three extracts from communications received by the author. One of the accomplished writers, the sagacious and learned Conybeare, alas, is already passed away!

“I feel painfully the slenderness of my claims to judge of such a work; I admire the research and study which it evinces; I honour above all the truthful and candid spirit which breathes in every line. I believe it to be a most valuable contribution to

² *Facts, etc.*, p. 112.

Biblical literature, and hope myself to derive great benefit from a more thorough study of it than I have ever yet had time to give. I feel compelled to differ materially from your view of inspiration: but I am astonished to hear that any should venture to pronounce such a work as your's dangerous, or 'heretical,' and blindly refuse to acknowledge its sterling value, and high and earnest tone." (*The Rev. Alfred Barry, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Author of an "Introduction to the Old Testament. Part i."*)

"I have read the parts in which your views on inspiration are explained, and am surprised at the attacks which they have called forth; since you have said nothing stronger than was previously said by Dr. Pye Smith and Dr. Arnold; but it would seem as if the advocates of 'verbal inspiration,' in proportion as they feel the hopelessness of their untenable position, were increasing the violence of their defence. I think you have laid down the right principle both positively and negatively when you say (p. 373) of the Scriptural writers, (1st) that 'they *were* religious and moral teachers;' (2nd) 'that they were *not* teachers of geography, botany, physiology, or history," etc., etc. (*The Rev. W. J. Conybeare, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, etc.*)

"No one can question the great value of your Introduction. I know no English work on the subject which can be compared with it; and I doubt whether any German Introduction is equally complete. . . . I do not then hesitate to say that your book has conferred a great benefit on English readers, by its fulness, accuracy, and candour. . . . And when I speak of your candour, I do not mean only in stating difficulties, but also in suggesting the right answers to them. As you have not, I think, underrated any objection, so you do not overrate them, and those who are conversant with German critics, will appreciate the rarity of this judicial fairness," etc., etc. (*The Rev. B. Foss Westcott, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Author of a "General Survey of the History of the Canon of the New Testament, during the first Four Centuries."*)

We greatly dislike personal references; but since individuals have brought themselves into consequential prominence in the present case, we feel justified in giving them a special share of attention. The Rev. J. Kelly is one of these; he has printed a pamphlet, etc. This pamphlet contains a very suggestive sentence—a sentence which gives a clue to the source of the agency against the Professor, and also compels us very reluctantly to examine into the writer's competency to sit in judgment in the summary way in which he seems to have done on the book. After Dr. Tregelles' letter appeared, he seems to have burnished his armour:—

"No time was lost," he says, "in obtaining the volume. I perused it with due attention, and without delay communicated to the author personally, in brief and general terms, the impression it had produced on my mind, suggesting at the same time the course which, in the circumstances, it seemed best for him to pursue. That suggestion was disregarded." Fatal mistake, to disregard the 'suggestion!' A very respectable pastor reads a work of unusual erudition, forming a *résumé* of countless opinions, theories, difficulties, which none but one of marvellous application and very varied acquirement could in the time produce, and at once communicates with the author, a Professor of high repute, "stating the course it seemed best for him to pursue." And the "suggestion was disregarded!" Well! We hope Mr. K. is an industrious pastor, but as to his competency to "state the course," etc., to the learned author of the second volume in Horne's *Introduction*, we find in the following particulars reason for doubt. We dip into a volume he not long ago published in the shape of *Discourses on Holy Scripture*, in many respects a very respectable production, with critical pretensions indicating some ambition, but, we must say,

indicating also very imperfect information on the history and results of sacred criticism. Out of many blemishes we mark only a few.

On p. 16 of the volume we find, *ex. gr.*, "There was a clear distinction from the first maintained between the inspired documents, which were deemed of authority for the establishment of doctrines, and those apocryphal writings which were used only for edification." The very reverse of this statement would be true; for we find that Irenæus, Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen, quote the apocryphal writings in the same way as the canonical, regarding them as *divine*, and as *scripture*. Origen refers expressly to the Maccabees as *authoritative scripture*.

"Nor is this distinction confined to Jerome; in various forms it is found in different writers, even from the earliest ages after the apostles" (p. 16). Of this again we can only say that it is totally incorrect. The distinction made by Jerome between the canonical and apocryphal writings is not so found from the earliest ages. Equally incorrect is the following: "They (the apocryphal writings) were never regarded as possessing authority by any branch of the Church, however corrupt, until the Council of Trent," etc. (p. 64). And how venturesome this: "Nothing can exceed in distinctness the statement, 'Every part of Scripture is divinely inspired.' If the writer has found this 'statement' in 2 Tim. iii. 16, then the Greek to him is a very elastic language."

"He (Josephus) distinctly asserts that during the reign of Artaxerxes, who succeeded Xerxes on the throne of Persia, the Canon of the Jewish Scriptures was completed," (p. 51). Josephus makes an *inference*, not an assertion. The writer simply quotes Stuart, who is in error. It is strange, again, that any professedly critical reader of the Bible should have made the following, apparently original, statement respecting the Mosaic civil law. "And not the least remarkable circumstance about it is that it continued without change, adapted to the circumstances of the people, until the constitution with which it was interwoven came to an end. Like every other work of God, it proceeded from his hand perfect . . . and susceptible of no improvement" (p. 257). Does it appear, then, that the civil law "continued without change," and was "susceptible of no improvement," when one compares Deuteronomy with Exodus and Leviticus? In various cases, too numerous for specification here, the regulations of the Mosaic code were modified, altered, amplified. There certainly was "change," and who will say there was no "improvement?"

"Although they (the apocryphal writings) must have been known to both Philo and Josephus, they are neither spoken of nor quoted as Scripture by either" (p. 63). We are inclined to deem the writer short in information here. Philo does not distinguish various books in the canonical collection any more than the Apocrypha. He looked on the Septuagint Version as actually *inspired*; therefore he was not the best authority for the writer. As to Josephus, although he does not *speak* of the apocryphal writings as Scripture, yet he *uses* one of them as such. In his *Ant.*, xi. 4, he has followed the apocryphal Esdras without hesitation, and tried to remove a difficulty in it, whereas, had he compared the Hebrew, the difficulty would at once have vanished.

Statements like the following indicate an imperfect professional edu-

cation. "*Speaking* and writing in Greek as the apostles for the most part appear to have done" (p. 94). Most persons of any scholarship know that the apostles did *not* for the most part *speak* Greek. "Philo and Josephus never intimate that there was the slightest difference in their times between the Hebrew and the Greek versions (*sic*) of the Old Testament Scriptures" (p. 56). It were cruel to expect Philo to give any such intimation, for he was as ignorant of Hebrew as our author apparently is of Philo. "We know that at a very early period there existed Latin versions of the New Testament, which had been so long in use before the time of Jerome as to have become considerably corrupt" (p. 27). The author has quoted correctly from Alexander on the canon, but he ought to have the merit of having examined such a statement. The existence of such Latin versions is *unknown*, therefore the notion is generally abandoned. "*The Talmud*, a Jewish work of the fifth or sixth century," etc. (p. 44). Must we inform the writer that there are two Talmuds, both "Jewish," always distinguished as the "Jerusalem Talmud," and the "Babylonian Talmud?" If it be said that the reference here is to the Babylonian, it is incorrect to assign it to the fifth or sixth century. "On the death of Malachi, the last of these prophets, the canon must of course have been finally closed" (p. 50). Even old Prideaux's "connexion" would have prevented this blunder. It is well known that the canon was not closed until a considerable time after the death of Malachi. "Several attempts have been made to shew that many of the books of the Old Testament, *not even excepting those of Moses*, were not written till a comparatively late period, so late indeed as about 140 B.C." (p. 49). Wherever did the author discover this? We are confident no biblical critic of any note has attempted to assign the books of Moses to so late a period. The reference to the books of Moses, is, we fancy original. "Their evidence (that of the Apostolic Fathers) represents the canon as already known and admitted by the Churches, inasmuch as the works which compose it were already received as of authority" (p. 18). This statement is very inaccurate. The Apostolic Fathers quote from several books of what now constitutes the canonical collection—an important fact as it regards such quoted books. But the writer makes too free use of his witnesses, when he makes them represent the "*canon*" as already known and admitted. So much for this "critical" writer, and his qualifications for passing judgment in the field of Biblical literature, and for pointing out to a learned professor "the course it seemed best for him to pursue" in consequence of having produced a work abreast of the times.

In reviewing the ferment which has taken place on this subject, we are forced most pensively to ponder the sad absence of true manhood and a vigorous faith among the Christian bodies of our land. There is no need for depreciation: we would rather exalt our brethren of all scriptural creeds; but while we admit that there is much good, we must also candidly, for further good's sake, mark the evil. "Sacred literature" may be with us a hobby, and we confess that we do love, and wish greatly to extol and magnify it; and that every attack, covert or open, upon its interests, provokes our strong indignation. But we have for this, we

think, a sufficient reason. Be this as it may, there is a clear need of two things amongst us—a *learnedly defended Bible*, and a *liberally constructed theology*. The clergy of all denominations are in the major part not penetrated by a fresh scientific theology. Forms of words exercise a regal sway. There is a dread of all enterprize in thought; and this in our day is a phenomenon confined to theology. The moderation which is the fruit of true culture is only exhibited here and there. People, like clergy, of all sects, to a great extent, cling to their Shibboleths, and forget too frequently the pure speech of heaven which must by and by become universally current and fuse all kindreds into one people. How little toleration of opinion in things not essential we see! How puny is forbearance—how eagle-eyed and wolf-hearted is the “heresy hunter!”

Nowhere do we see this more painfully exhibited than in the treatment men of learning in the domain of sacred literature receive. No sooner are Christian men of less learning called on to exercise moderation and discrimination; to recognize a difficulty where an easy and superficial faith had taken all for granted; to trace the chain of evidence back to its first links, and receive a modified account; to analyze the elements of the faith, rather than rest in mystifying generalities; and to use generous liberality towards those who, “holding the head,” yet arrive at differing conclusions on debateable points in criticism or exegesis, than they break out into manifest impatience, and give signs of a temper that would ride roughshod over the faith of other men. Of all marks of an emasculated pietism, none is more sure, we take it, than a boisterous and swaggering show of zeal for truth coupled with a practical denial of its spirit. When propositions wrought out by the intellect—in their stereotyped form the mere fruit of metaphysical speculation—are erected as idols, while the obligations of charity, truth, and even humanity are disregarded, we also say there is “danger.” Sincerity and conscience no doubt may be pleaded; but sincerity and conscience wedded to spiritual power and pride, have ever been prolific parents of a persecuting and barbaric intolerance. The peril of novelties to the faith may be pleaded; but a faith that is true need not fear the test of investigation: a pure coin only shews its value all the more in presence of a counterfeit. Zeal for an outraged Bible is pleaded. We have yet to learn that the Bible stands in need of the hot-house conservancy, sought now-a-days to be lent to it. The truth of the matter is, that zeal for the Bible and for the essentials of Christ’s religion is not a thing of the *letter* so much as a thing of the *spirit*. Luther led the way to a sound faith and a living Church, though he rejected the Second of Peter and the Book of Revelation, and dismissed the Epistle of James as “*eine rechte stroherne Epistel*.” Neander forced back the wave of rationalism in Germany, although he placed in the category of the uncanonical, several portions of the New Testament. Who will not venerate the name of Augustine, notwithstanding that he considered as canonical, and of the prophetic class, the apocryphal books of *Wisdom* and *Ecclesiasticus*, and speaks of some of the New Testament books as to be received before others? Are we to cover the names of these illustrious men with derision, and blast their reputation—we *can* no longer wound their feelings—because they failed to believe with us on every less

important point? Be it so. Then we only demonstrate our own imbecile folly, and our utter incompetency to deal with the true and the great.

But whatever comes, the true scholar knows the value of his prize, and can afford to suffer. He may even say as Schiller said, "*Das Leben ist der Güter höchstes nicht.*"

HEBREWS v. 7.

To the Editor of "The Journal of Sacred Literature."

SIR,—You will greatly oblige me by a little space in reply to the remarks of your correspondent W. M. on Hebrews v. 7. He dissents from the rendering which I propose, "to save him *out of* death," but the tone of his communication is so temperate and Christian, he withal concedes so much in reference to the text in question, not generally conceded, and which I feel to be of great value, that I am more than rewarded for the time and thought bestowed on my former communication. I would now take up, briefly, what appears worthy of notice in his remarks.

His first objection is, that when the preposition *ἐκ* signifies *out of*, it always implies that the person delivered is in the state out of which the deliverance rescues him. But our Lord, when offering the prayers referred to, was not in the state of death; he only contemplated it as a state or condition in which he was to be. Now your correspondent himself seems to me to suggest the true answer to this objection, when he tells us that doubtless Christ "threw himself forward," realizing, in the intensity of faith, the future as the present. It is in fact, the prerogative of perfect faith to overleap, yea, to annihilate all distinctions of time. God himself believes assuredly in the fulfilment of his own promises, and let us mark his language. He "calleteth those things which be not," says St. Paul, "as though they were." And in proof of this we have his assurance to Abraham (not *I will make* thee, though the event was in the far distant future, but) "*I have made* thee a father of many nations" (Rom. iv. 16, 17). The same principle evidently applies to Christ. Let us take one example from the Psalms; it bears exactly on the point before us. "Return, O Lord, deliver my soul: oh *save* me for thy mercies' sake. For *in death* there is no remembrance of thee: in the grave who shall give thee thanks?" (Ps. vi. 4, 5). I take these, without question, as the words of the Saviour. And they are a prayer to be saved out of death by one who already realized himself in the state of death.

But while I thus adopt your correspondent's own explanation of the difficulty, I must add, that he appears to me to have greatly overstated it. His own texts do not bear him out in saying that *ἐκ*, as applied to deliverance out of any evil, always implies the actual experience of the evil. He refers, for example, to James v. 20, "He that converteth the

sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from death (*ἐκ θάνατου*), and shall hide a multitude of sins." The death here meant, he says, "is spiritual death, the sinner's actual present condition." I cannot accept this interpretation. It is inconsistent with the words that follow, "shall hide a multitude of sins." It is inconsistent also with another text he himself quotes (James i. 15), "Sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death." The death which sin brings forth, when finished, is the wrath of God, that wrath which is the sinner's assured portion unless he is converted from the error of his way, and so finds the blessedness of transgression forgiven and sin hidden or covered. (Ps. xxxii. 1). The meaning of St. James is therefore plainly this. *He that converteth the sinner from the error of his way, shall save a soul from God's impending wrath, and shall cause to be covered a multitude of sins.* So then we have *ἐκ θάνατου*, though the *θάνατος* was only impending. Why may we not have it in the Saviour's case also? He prayed to be saved *ἐκ θάνατου*, the death impending over him.

The best proof of the justness of this criticism is to be found in the common, every day use, of the English *out of*; and the remark applies equally to the Greek *ἐκ*. A general says, "I shall engage the enemy to-morrow. I pray God that I may come safe *out of* the battle." This would be expressed in Greek by *ἐκ τῆς μάχης*. Is there any impropriety in such English or such Greek? Would any one think of saying, the speaker is not yet in the battle; and how can he pray to come safe *out of* it? The common sense answer would be, he expects to be in it, and his prayer *σώθηναι ἐκ τῆς μάχης* has reference to that expectation. It is so with the text before us. We are ever to remember that holy Scripture is written in the common language of mankind.

Your correspondent's second objection is, that the interpretation proposed by me, supposes Christ to have prayed for the mercy of resurrection; and that "we do not find the slightest intimation in the whole history of Christ, that he ever so prayed." This objection is more theological than critical. I confess it surprises me. Your correspondent cannot need to be told that the Psalms contain the words of the Lord Jesus; if they do not, our Church most grievously errs in the selection she has made for our fasts and festivals. We are not, then, to go to the gospel-narrative alone for our knowledge of the Saviour. Just as the Book of Acts is more the record of St. Paul's outer life, while his epistles lay bare his heart with its hidden joys and sorrows; so the gospels give us more of our Saviour's outward walk, while the Psalms lead us into his closet and give us to hear the inner breathings of his soul. And do these inner breathings contain no prayer for resurrection? Let the book itself tell us. We have the positive statement of Psalm xxi. concerning the King Messiah. "*He asked life of thee, and thou gavest it him, even length of days, for ever and ever.*" We have the very words in which such petitions were expressed. I have referred already to the sixth Psalm, and now refer to it again. But lest any should question its being a psalm of Christ, let me refer to the eighty-eighth, which our Church has selected for Good Friday, and which Bishop Horsley entitles "The Lamentation of Messiah." Let us put off our shoes from off our feet, for the place on which we

stand is holy ground. "I have called daily upon thee, I have stretched forth my hands unto thee: wilt thou shew wonders to the dead, shall the dead arise and praise thee? Shall thy loving kindness be declared in the grave, or thy faithfulness in destruction? Shall thy wonders be known in the dark, and thy righteousness in the land of forgetfulness? Yes, for unto thee have I cried, O Lord, and in the morning shall my prayer prevent thee." (The last verse is rendered from Horsley). What words are these? I as assuredly believe them to be the *ipsissima verba* of those prayers and supplications, that strong crying and tears by which our blessed Lord laid hold on the promised mercy of resurrection, as I recognize the prayers of Gethsemane to be his. I might refer in confirmation, to many other psalms containing similar words. But I have done so, already, in my former paper. And if your correspondent will turn to the psalms there cited, and give them the consideration which is their due, I think he will hardly again hazard the assertion, that in Christ's whole history we find no record of his praying to be raised from the dead.

Your correspondent brings forward, as a part of the same objection, that such prayers, on Christ's part, are inconsistent with the firm, rejoicing confidence, that he should rise again, which always possessed his spirit. I think it most important to state in reply to this, that prayer, so far as it is true, is the creature's *Amen* to God's declared purpose, and is therefore the language, not of uncertainty, but of confidence and hope. Let us take an example. God has said, that he will cause his name to be hallowed, that he will bring in his kingdom, and that his will shall be done on the earth; he has assured his people that he will give them their daily bread, that he will pardon their sins, and keep them from the hour of temptation. And yet Christ himself, in his model of prayer, has taught us to ask for all these things. Are we to ask them in uncertainty and doubt? In so far as we do so, we are not praying; we are to ask in "firm, rejoicing confidence." But why ask at all, if we have already the sure promise of God? Because it is God's appointment that we shall lay hold of his promised mercy by faith, by hope, by supplication. This tells us why Christ prayed for the mercy of resurrection, though it was guaranteed to him by the promise of God. Made in all things like unto his brethren, he received every blessing just as we receive it; he therefore ceased not to believe, to hope for, and to plead the promises of the Father's mercy till these promises were gloriously fulfilled. The tone of such prayers might be mournful; they might be, as St. Paul calls them, "strong crying and tears." But it was not the mournfulness of doubt, the bewilderment of uncertainty. It arose from an intense realization (let all the psalms bear witness) of the darkness into which he was descending, from which, with a "voice raised high by the earnestness of agonizing supplication" (Stewart), he pleaded with Jehovah to bring him up again.

Your correspondent's third and fourth objections are, that I represent our Lord as habitually praying for the mercy of resurrection, but that while the prayers were habitual, the answer was reserved for one especial occasion. It is sufficient briefly to state in reply, that the resurrection of our blessed Lord is not to be regarded as something standing by itself. As the birth of a child into the world is the commencement of this human

life, with all its varied history, so resurrection was to him the portal to everlasting life, the commencement of that "joy set before him" for which he "endured the cross, despising the shame." Can we conceive then any subject more worthy of being habitual with him, or more worthy of taking its place in those holy communings with the Father, for which he retired so often to the desert and the mountain top? It concerned that Father's glory, it concerned his people's salvation, it concerned the best and dearest interests of that world which he had come to save. It was more than an especial occasion; it was mercy for eternity, the fulfilment of those high and holy objects for which he had become incarnate and was about to die.

I notice very briefly, your correspondent's fifth objection, that by the view which I have proposed, Christ's learning obedience is not brought out. I cannot see this. God's way of salvation to man is through faith, through hope, through prayer; by these we lay hold on his eternal promises. But they can be laid hold of only in the way of *obedience*, he is "the author of eternal salvation to them that obey him" (Hebrews v. 9). And he himself, though the Saviour, was no exception to this everlasting canon. He believed, he hoped, he prayed, and he "was heard *in that he feared*," inheriting the promises in the way of obedience. It was thus he "learned obedience," "I have kept my Father's commandments, and abide in his love" (John xv. 10). He learned it "by the things which he suffered," nothing could be more grievous to nature than was his course on earth, he himself describes it as a daily cross. I quite admit with your correspondent, that the solemn scenes of Gethsemane were especially fitted to teach this lesson, for obedience in its essence is obedience to another's will. But the question is, whether the words, "who *in the days of his flesh* learned obedience by the things which he suffered," indicate the special lesson of one solemn evening, or a series of lessons, a *life-long* lesson? And, again, the question is, whether we are to expect the reference contained in these words to constitute a peculiarity in the epistle? The testimony of the holy evangelists is, throughout the epistle, *simply ignored*; the other truths concerning Christ (truths of which they are full), his Sonship—his holiness—his relations to his people—his eternal Priesthood—are elaborated in it, from the Old Testament alone. And are we then to expect that in setting before us his human infirmity, the apostle should refer us to St. Luke? The answers to these questions point plainly in one direction. And if we turn in that direction, the apostle's reference meets us at once. We find lessons of obedience through suffering; in connexion, too, with accepted prayers for the mercy of resurrection, abundantly in the Book of Psalms. I will take only one example from a Psalm to which I have twice referred already. After the prayer in Psalm vi. 4, 5, "O save me for thy mercies' sake, for in death there is no remembrance of thee,"—a prayer strikingly like the text before us, for he adds, "I water my couch *with my tears*,"—the Saviour expresses this joyful confidence, "the Lord hath heard my supplication, the Lord will receive my prayer." Now he was thus heard "in that he feared." Mark, then, the lesson of obedience, "Depart from me, all ye workers of iniquity;" of obedience learned through suffering, "the Lord hath heard the voice of *my weeping*." I desire

nothing, I can conceive nothing plainer than this Hebrews v. 7, 8, simply presents to us, in a condensed form, the prayers and experience detailed in the sixth Psalm.

Let me only say, in conclusion, that I have very great satisfaction in two concessions of your correspondent, believing them to be most important for the elucidation of this passage. He allows that the words, "Him that was able to save him from death," present the aspect in which Christ viewed God, and that therefore *to be saved out of death, or from death*, was the blessing prayed for. A great step is thus gained; we know of what the prayers and supplications, of which the apostle speaks, consisted. Whereas Professor Stewart, and those who follow him, taking the words in question as a mere title of the Supreme Being, leave us altogether in the dark as to what the Redeemer was desiring, what he was seeking at God's hand.

The other concession is to me still more valuable. He says, that *εἰσακουσθεῖς* had its entire fulfilment in resurrection. The Saviour "was heard," not merely in that he was sustained in Gethsemane, but in that he was brought again from the grave. The meekness, the quietness, the holy submission of that hour, sealed the Father's resolution to raise such a sufferer from the dead. Now this is important on two accounts. It recognizes resurrection as the act of *the Father's* power. Many in their zeal for the Godhead of Christ, maintain that it was the act of his own power. But such a view dislocates the redemption-relations of the Persons of the blessed Trinity, and altogether destroys the example which a dying and rising Saviour has left his believing people. I am, therefore, most thankful to see the opposite affirmed. And I am thankful on another account. If *εἰσακουσθεῖς* had its fulfilment in resurrection—if resurrection "was a part of the Father's hearing and the Father's answer"—the hearing of, and answer to the prayer *σώθῃναι ἐκ θανάτου*, what, I ask, did that prayer cover, in what did it terminate? Not surely in present support, or in the conditional petition, "if it be possible, let this cup pass," but in that very resurrection. The Saviour, in offering it, had his eye fixed on the grand consummation, that presence where there is fulness of joy, that right hand where there are pleasures for evermore. On your correspondent's own admission, I think this must be allowed.

Parsonage, Rugby,
September 19th, 1857.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM TAIT.

HEBREWS IX. 16—17.

SIR,—You will oblige me by finding room for the following brief remarks on the paper of L. F., in your July number, on Hebrews ix. 16, 17.

It is surely a safe rule in interpreting Holy Scripture, to take the natural and obvious meaning of its sentences, not to try what meaning these sentences may be made to bear. Let us apply this rule to the case before us. Let any one read Hebrews ix. 16, 17, having no purpose to

serve, and simply desiring to gather their meaning. I venture to say, that he will never question that ὁ διαθέμενος is the nominative to ζῆ; more especially as ὅτε ζῆ ὁ διαθέμενος of verse 17, manifestly corresponds to θάνατον τοῦ διαθέμενου of verse 16. No doubt it is possible to put a comma after ζῆ, and to make ὁ διαθέμενος the nominative to μηδὲν ἰσχυεῖ, translating, as your correspondent does, *the covenant-maker can effect nothing whilst the victim lives*. But I must say, that it appears to me extremely forced and unnatural, and what no one would ever think of, unless difficulties connected with the passage, forced him to try what meaning he could bring out of the words.

Leaving, however, the critical question, and supposing your correspondent correct in his rendering, what do we gain by it? Nothing, that to my mind, is even intelligible. The object of the apostle in the preceding context, is to prove the necessity of the death of Christ. Take the rendering of our authorized version: a testator must die to give effect to a testament; therefore Christ behoved to die. Or take the other rendering proposed: in all cases of covenants, a mediating sacrifice must die; therefore Christ behoved to die. Or take the rendering which I propose: a covenant-maker breaking a covenant must die; our fathers are in that position, and therefore need atoning blood.

In all these renderings you have something intelligible, a solemn reason given for a great and solemn fact. But take the rendering of your correspondent, and what have you? *Christ behoved to die. Why? Because in all cases of covenants made, the death of the covenant-maker must be represented, to denote the death of the offerers, should they break their covenant.* What has this to do with the matter in hand? The apostle is speaking not about *representation*, but about *reality*. He is giving us a reason, not why Moses appointed certain sacrifices (that comes after), but why God sent his Son as the great antitypical sacrifice. Moreover, that reason was not as your correspondent's rendering implies. Christ was no covenant-breaker, neither did he die as such. Others, viz., the Jewish fathers were covenant-breakers, it was for them he died. But bring in this thought, and you come at once to my interpretation.

Parsonage, Rugby,
September 25th.

Yours faithfully,
WILLIAM TAIT.

THE DARIUS OF SCRIPTURE.

SIR,—Notwithstanding the able defence of Mr. Bosanquet, with regard to the supposed identity of "Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes," with Darius, the son of Hystaspes, of the seed of the Persians; there appear to be such insuperable objections to this opinion from Scripture, profane history, and the inscriptions, that I must ask leave to lay before your readers, in addition to my previous letter, some grounds for rejecting a theory which is so contrary to the generally received idea

of Scripture commentators, both at the present time, and during past ages.

I. Premising that in the writings of prophets, we have both infallible as well as contemporaneous authorities with reference to the point in dispute, let me notice how accurately they appear to distinguish between the pre-eminence of the Medes to the Persians, *previous* to the fall of Babylon and the reign of "Darius the Mede," and the reverse *subsequent* to these events; *e. g.* Daniel invariably mentions the Medes before the Persians; the author of the book of Esther, except in one instance (chap. x.), gives the Persians precedence over the Medes, and this exception may be accounted for as merely expressive of priority in chronological arrangement, and equivalent to "the book of the Chronicles of the kings of Media, and of the kings of Persia." How can this distinction be accounted for, except by considering that the Median kingdom was not overthrown or absorbed by the Persian Cyrus previous to the *first* siege of Babylon, which Daniel, and Herodotus, and Xenophon all alike record? This agrees with the prophetic announcements of Isaiah and Jeremiah on the subject, "I will stir up *the Medes* against them (the Babylonians), (Isa. xiii. 17). "Besiege, O Media—Babylon is fallen, is fallen," (Isa. xxi. 2, 9). "The Lord hath raised up the spirit of the *kings of the Medes*; for his device is against Babylon to destroy it," (Jer. li. 11). Surely these prophecies must mean that Media was to hold a prominent part in the punishment of the king of Babylon previous to the failure of her own line of kings. Hence, it necessarily follows, that some king of Media was reigning when Belshazzar's "kingdom was divided and given to *the Medes* and Persians," (Dan. v. 28); that Herodotus must be incorrect in naming Astyages as the *last* king of Media, and as dethroned by Cyrus previous to the capture of Babylon; and that Darius Hystaspes, the Persian, could not have occupied the united thrones of Media and Persia at that time. Mr. Bosanquet, however, does not admit this inference, that the Darius (whoever he was), received the throne of Babylon when Belshazzar was slain, as I see, he objects to the natural reasoning of your correspondent, "G. B." on the subject,^a and adopts the argument of Sir John Marsham, "that by the same process we might prove that Belshazzar succeeded Cyrus on the throne, because chap. vi. ends with the words, "In the reign of Cyrus the Persian;" and chap. vii. begins with the words, "In the first year of Belshazzar." But there is this all-important distinction between the two cases; the former has the conjunctive particle ו, which, as Lee in his Hebrew lexicon observes, is used "to couple together words, phrases, sentences, periods, paragraphs, etc., either similar or similarly intended," and which necessarily connects Dan. xi. 31 with the preceding clause (ver. 30); the latter has no such conjunction. I think, therefore, that the paragraph division of the authorized version at the commencement of verse 30, is to be preferred to that of Walton, or Jahn, who make the division at the following verse, as a close investigation of the subject fully bears out the force of "G. B.'s"

^a *J. S. L.*, Oct., p. 167.

reasoning, that it is "offering something like violence to the obvious tenour of the scriptural narrative, to suppose that Darius the Mede did not at once receive the kingdom which had belonged to Belshazzar."

Mr. Bosanquet objects likewise to an argument which I had used in my former letter, to prove that as Daniel prophesies the standing up of three kings between the time of "Darius the Mede," when Cyrus reigned in Persia, and Xerxes, "the fourth, far richer than they all," (xi. 2), on the grounds that as *וְעַד* is rendered "yet," in Gen. xlv. 28, and the LXX. render *עַד* by *ἀνθεστηκασιν*, we are, therefore, warranted in understanding the passage to mean that "three kings of Persia had already stood up in the first year of Darius the Mede," whom he contends is Darius Hystaspes, and that therefore the date of the fall of Babylon, and other events, must be lowered in consequence. G. B. has sufficiently answered such a strange rendering of the Hebrew,^b and I will only add with reference to the Greek of the LXX., the opinion of a competent judge. "So very erroneous," says Hartwell Horne, "was the version of Daniel, that it was totally rejected by the ancient Church, and Theodotion's translation substituted for it. The Septuagint version of Daniel was discovered at Rome in 1772, from which it appears that its author had but an imperfect knowledge of the Hebrew language."^c Believing this to be fully borne out in the passage in question, it is impossible to accept the translation of the LXX., which omits the word *וְעַד* altogether, and places *עַד* in the perfect tense, but must still adhere to the translation of the Authorized Version, and that of Theodotion, who has correctly rendered it *ἔτι . . . ἀναστήσονται*. I would observe that were the LXX. right, it would be impossible to make their translation agree with our knowledge of Persian history, whereas Theodotion's exactly accords with what we learn from the historians and the Behistun inscription respecting it. Moreover, it should not be forgotten, that this prophecy appears to have been revealed to Daniel, not, as is sometimes supposed, "in the first year of Darius the Mede" (Dan. xi. 1); but "in the third year of Cyrus, king of Persia" (Dan. x. 1), between whom and Xerxes, who "stirred up all against the realm of Grecia," there stood up "yet three kings in Persia;" for the personal pronoun "I," in Dan. xi. 1, is evidently the revealing angel and not the prophet. Again the LXX., Theodotion, and the Armenian Version all read "Cyrus the king," in place of "Darius the Mede;" the note attached to the first of these three authorities, in the Göttingen Edition of 1774, being "*Κυρου βασιλεως—Cyri Regni, LXX. senes legerunt in Hebrew לַכִּיּוֹשׁ לִמְדָּה loco Darii Medi. Theodotio Cyrum quoque habet, aliter tamen legit,*" which is additional ground for believing that the prophecy was delivered *after* the reign of Darius the Mede, *during* the reign of Cyrus the Persian, and referred to his three successors, Xerxes the fourth being, as Daniel says, "far richer than they all;" and in accordance with the testimony of Herodotus, who says the expedition of Xerxes against Greece "was by far the greatest of all we know; so that the one of Darius against the Scythians appears

^b *J. S. L.*, Oct., p. 171.

^c *Introduction to the Scriptures*, part i., chap. iii., lect. 3, § 2.

as nothing, when compared with this." ^d Thus, then, it is sufficiently clear from Scripture, that a *Median king* was to be an instrument in the punishment of the king of Babylon; and that a king of the Medes, called "Darius," took the throne of the Chaldeans at the time that Belshazzar's kingdom was "divided and given to the Medes and Persians." We learn also that Cyrus, who is called "king of Persia" by Daniel, was appointed by God to perform his pleasure after the seventy years captivity, and the punishment of the king of Babylon (Jer. xxv. 11, 12), "even saying to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be built; and to the Temple, thy foundation shall be laid." (Isa. xlv. 28.) We further find, after that judgment had been inflicted upon Babylon, Cyrus is called by the sacred annalist, "king of Persia" (Ezra i. 1, 2), and is represented as issuing the decree for the building of the Temple at Jerusalem. He is also called "king of Babylon" (Ezra v. 13). And he must have reigned over the Medes at the same time, for a successor of this Cyrus, called by Ezra, "Darius, king of Persia," and the third in descent from him, as the two intermediate kings who stopped the building of the Temple, are expressly named as Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes, is represented as giving the Jews permission to resume the building of the Temple, on the authority of Cyrus' original decree for that purpose, which "was found at Achmetha (Ecbatana) in the palace, that is, *in the province of the Medes*" (Ezra vi. 2). That this Darius, king of Persia, was the same as Darius Hystaspes, I believe, has never been doubted; but it seems impossible to identify him with "Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes," who was clearly reigning in Babylon *before* Cyrus gave the Jews permission to build the Temple at Jerusalem.

II. Thus much from what Scripture teaches on the subject, nor does the just inference from the inscriptions contradict this conclusion. Although Mr. Bosanquet naturally argues in favour of his theory from the absence of the name of "Darius the Mede," as a king of Babylon on any yet deciphered inscription, I may be permitted to remark, that this in reality does not prove anything, for "Darius the Mede's" reign in Babylon must have been of a brief duration, not extending perhaps over one, or, at the utmost, two years; and we might on the same grounds argue against the existence of Artaxerxes Longimanus, or Artaxerxes Memnon, neither of whom have left us any memorial which has yet been discovered.^e There are, however, strong grounds for inferring from the inscriptions which have been decyphered, that Darius Hystaspes could not be the same as "Darius the Mede;" *e.g.* on the Behistun Rock Darius is represented as saying, "There was not a man, neither *Persian nor Median*, who would dispossess of the empire Gomates the Magian—I firmly established the kingdom, both Persia and Media." Here it will be observed, that Persia precedes Media, as in Scripture, *after* the time of "Darius the Mede." Further we read, "I am Darius the king, the great king, the king of Persia—the son of Hystaspes, the grandson of Arsanes, the Achæmenian—says Darius the king. My father was Hystaspes; the father

^d *Polymnia*, vii., xx.

^e See Vaux's *Nineveh and Persepolis*, chap. x.

of Hystaspes was Arsames; the father of Arsames was Ariyaramnes; the father of Ariyaramnes was Teispes; the father of Teispes was Achæmenes—says Darius the king, on that account we have been called Achæmenians. There are eight of my race who have been kings before me; I am the ninth.” The solution of this last clause may be obtained by understanding it to refer to Darius himself, with his five above-named ancestors, together with Cyrus, and his father and son, both bearing the name of Cambyses; for we have an inscription on the ruined pilasters at Murghab, or Parsagadæ, first attributed by Professor Grotefend to Cyrus, and which Sir H. Rawlinson and M. Lassen both agree in reading “I am Cyrus, the king; the Achæmenian,” proving thereby that Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes alike sprung from the same stock, the Persian Achæmenes, and Darius being thus of the blood-royal, may have spoken of all his ancestors as kings together with Cyrus, his father and son, all of whom were descendants of Achæmenes. Further, we find from an inscription at Nakhsh-i-Rustam, in the second paragraph, Darius stating that he was “a Persian, the son of a Persian; an Asian, and of Asian extraction.” Now all this shews that Darius Hystaspes had no ancestor of the name of Ahasuerus, or of anything like it, and being of pure Persian descent, it seems impossible to identify him with “Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes.” Moreover, the Behistun inscription proves, in accordance with the testimony of Herodotus, that Darius Hystaspes succeeded to the throne after the destruction of Gomates, the Magian (the Smerdis of Herodotus, and the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. 7), who is thus mentioned in the inscription, “This Gomates, the Magian, was an impostor.” He thus declared, “I am Bartius, the son of Cyrus; I am king.” Seeing, moreover, that the Behistun rock represents Darius Hystaspes as reigning *after* Cyrus, and as putting down amongst other rebellions one in the province of Babylon,^f and as destroying the usurper Phraortes, who claimed the throne of Media in right of descent from Cyaxares (apparently the son of Astyages, and according to Xenophon, the last king of Media), it necessarily follows that he could not be the same as Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, who reigned over the Medes, according to Scripture, *before* Cyrus. I think this opinion may be supported by comparing the engraving of Darius Hystaspes, as it appears on the Behistun rock, with the engraving of the sovereign, represented on the very rare gold coins called the Persian darics, and which are generally assumed to have been coined by Darius Hystaspes. Prideaux, however observes, on the authority of Harpocration, *Scoliastes Aristophanis ad Eccles.*, pp. 741, 742, and *Suidas sub voce Δαρεικος*, “that the author of this coin was *not* Darius Hystaspes, as some have imagined, but an ancients Darius.” And he justly concludes, that as “there is no ancients Darius known to have reigned in the East, excepting only this Darius, whom the Scripture calls Darius the Median, therefore it is most likely that he was the author of this coin.”^g I venture to think this conclusion a just one, from the fact that the sovereign’s crown on the gold Persian daric, as given in Green’s

^f Herodotus calls it “the *second* capture of Babylon.”—*Thalia*, iii. 159.

^g Connexion of the *Old and New Testament*, part i., l. ii.

Numismatic Atlas, is of a different shape from that of Darius Hystaspes, as it appears in the sculpture on the Behistun Rock. Moreover, as the sovereign's crown on the Persian daric has three points, there may be some allusion to the "three presidents, of whom Daniel was the first," which Darius, the Mede, set over the other princes, when he took the kingdom from Belshazzar (Dan. v. 30, 31; vi. 1, 2), and who, as Prideaux supposes, coined his money from the great amount of specie found in the city of Babylon. And the engraving of Darius Hystaspes on the Behistun Rock, with a crown having seven points, like embattlements, according to heraldry, naturally suggests an allusion to the seven princes of Persia, referred to by Herodotus (iii. 76, etc.), and mentioned by name in the Book of Esther (i. 14), as enjoying certain privileges in the reign of Ahasuerus, certainly a successor of Darius Hystaspes, and most probably, as Josephus determines, his grandson Artaxerxes Longimanus. Thus it appears that the fair inference from the inscriptions, even though the name of "Darius, the Mede," is not to be found amongst them, forbids our identifying him with Darius Hystaspes, who was unquestionably a successor, and not a predecessor of Cyrus, on the throne of Babylon.

III. Do the historians confirm this opinion or not? It is true, that neither Herodotus nor Ctesias make mention of "Darius, the Mede;" but Xenophon does, as many suppose, under the name of Cyaxares. This answers to the account of Daniel, and agrees, as I have before remarked, with the testimony of the Behistun Rock, as regards the claim of the rebel Phraortes, in the reign of Darius Hystaspes, resting it, as he does, upon a king called "Cyaxares," who, as we may naturally suppose, was in reality the last king of the Medes; and if so, the testimony of Xenophon is to be preferred to that of Herodotus.^h But if I do not misunderstand Mr. Bosanquet, his chief argument for discarding the long-entertained opinion respecting "Darius, the Mede," is, that it will not agree chronologically with Herodotus' testimony concerning the eclipse of Thales. This may be stated in brief as follows: that the war between the Medes and Lydians was terminated by an eclipse foretold by Thales, the Milesian, *during the reign of Cyaxares I.*,ⁱ which Mr. Bosanquet considers has been conclusively proved to have happened B. c. 583; that the siege of Nineveh, and the twenty-eight years' irruption of the Scythians, took place subsequently to the war with the Lydians, during the reign of the same king, and therefore the chronology of this period must be considerably lowered, and may be so adjusted, as to bring the reign of Belshazzar, as successor of Nebuchadnezzar the contemporary of Cyaxares I., and the termination of the seventy years' captivity at Babylon, within the reign of Darius Hystaspes, and thus accept him as the Darius of Daniel, who obtained the throne of the Chaldeans. I believe this is a fair statement of Mr. Bosanquet's theory; but there appear to be strong reasons against admitting it. For, first, it may be clearly shewn from Herodotus himself, that Cyaxares I. died B. c. 594, and consequently could not have been alive nine years later, B. c. 585, when it is assumed that the eclipse

^h See *J. S. L.*, Oct., p. 170, with regard to Cicero's remark concerning him.

ⁱ *Her.* i. 74.

foretold by Thales occurred. This may be proved as follows. It is universally admitted that the battle of Marathon was fought in the third year of the seventy-second Olympiad, B. c. 490, and four years before the death of Darius Hystaspes, whose reign lasted thirty-six years.^k Hence we obtain the following dates :

The battle of Marathon was fought	B. c., 490 years.	
Darius reigned previous to the battle	32 „	
Smerdis and Cambyses	8 „	<i>Her.</i> iii. 66.
Cyrus	29 „	<i>Do.</i> i. 214.
Astyages	35 „	<i>Do.</i> i. 130.
<hr/>		
Consequently the death of Cyaxares I., the father of } Astyages, must be dated B.C.	594 years.	

Thus it appears from Herodotus, that Cyaxares I. was dead nine years before the assumed dates of Thales' eclipse.

Secondly. It may be equally shewn that we cannot draw any sure conclusion from anything recorded by Herodotus respecting eclipses. It is unnecessarily assumed, that nothing but a *total* one will satisfy the conditions of the eclipse foretold by Thales, and which Herodotus affirms terminated the war between the Lydians and Medes; that as there was no other *total* eclipse visible at the supposed scene of action about that time in Asia Minor, therefore it necessarily follows that the battle was fought B. c. 585, and that Cyaxares I. was alive at that time, and for many years after. Mr. Bosanquet quotes the Astronomer Royal as saying, "there can be no question, that the eclipse of May 28, B. c. 585, is that predicted by Thales, and that which put an end to war between Lydia and Media."^l Notwithstanding so great an authority in favour of the eclipse of B. c. 585, which opinion previous astronomers, Fergusson and Sir Isaac Newton, had alike entertained, it should be remembered that this conclusion is grounded upon the assumed necessity of finding some *total* eclipse to represent the one which Thales had foretold. *But so far as the words of Herodotus are concerned*, there are certainly no grounds for assuming that it was a *total* eclipse. What Herodotus says on the subject is, that "during the war between the Medes and Lydians, they had a kind of nocturnal combat. In the sixth year, when they were carrying on the war nearly equally on both sides, they came to battle, and whilst they were contending for victory, the day was suddenly turned into night; which alteration Thales, the Milesian, had foretold to the Ionians, and named the year when it should happen. The Lydians and Medes seeing darkness succeeding in the place of light, desisted from fighting, and shewed a great inclination on both sides to make peace."^m Let us weigh the value of this testimony with regard to the necessity of considering Thales' eclipse a *total* one, by considering what the same historian says respecting eclipses at other times, *e. g.*, speaking of Xerxes' expedition against Greece, in the spring of 480 B. c., he says, "The army being fully prepared, set out, at the beginning of the spring, *from Sardis*,

^k *Her.* vii. 1—4.

^l *J. S. L.*, Oct., 1857.

^m *Clio.* i. 74.

where it had wintered towards Abydos. When it was on the point of setting out, *the sun quitting his seat in the heavens, disappeared*; and though the air was perfectly serene and free from clouds, *a sudden night ensued in the place of day*; this excited Xerxes when he saw it, and he inquired of the Magi what the prodigy might portend?"* In the first place, there was no eclipse at all visible at Sardis B. c. 480, when Xerxes commenced his expedition from that place; but there was one in the spring of the year preceding, *i. e.* April 10, B. c. 481, according to M. Pingrè's tables, which happened about the time of Xerxes' departure from Susa. Herodotus had doubtless heard that an eclipse took place at the time of the expedition, and evidently imagined that it occurred at the time of Xerxes' departure from Sardis, which was *a year later* than that from Susa, when it really took place. And, secondly, it has been proved by Dr. Brinkley, as Hales, l. iii., § vii. informs us, that this eclipse, instead of being a *total* one, as his words imply, *fully as much as what he says respecting Thales' eclipse*, it did not exceed $1\frac{3}{4}$ digit in quantity, *or less than a quarter of an eclipse*. And as Herodotus was born B. c. 484, *i. e.* four years before the time, which he is here recording, and could make so great a mistake and an exaggeration respecting an event, which happened within the memory of men then living, how much more likely to be mistaken respecting an eclipse which must have taken place more than 100 years before his birth. Herodotus is likewise mistaken in speaking of an eclipse as *prior* to the battle of Plataea, which was fought on Sept. 22, B. c. 479, whereas L'Archer remarks, on the authority of M. Pingrè, that it happened *subsequent* to that event. With these detected mistakes, we may consider there are no just grounds for asserting, that because Herodotus records the eclipse foretold by Thales, as having happened during the reign of Cyaxares I., that it referred to the *total* one visible in Asia Minor, May 28, B. c. 585. As any eclipse previous to B. c. 594, when Cyaxares I. died, is more likely to be the one to which Herodotus refers, it may be well to mention the various opinions which have been entertained on the subject by distinguished authorities, *e. g.* :—

		B. C.
Volney dates it	Feb. 3rd	625.
Oltmans, Bailly	Sept. 30th	610.
Calvisius either that of July 30th, 607, or that of	Dec. 3rd	605.
Bayer, Hales, Hincks	May 18th	603.
Usher, Prideaux	Sept. 20th	601.
Petavius, L'Archer, L'Abbe Barthelemy	July 9th	597.

Whichever be the one predicted by Thales, it is clear that Herodotus's words do not require that it should have been a *total* one, the point on which Mr. Bosanquet's argument turns, and therefore there is no occasion for lowering the chronology of that period on such grounds.

III. With reference to the testimony of profane historians, generally, on the subject in dispute, I would commend to the attention of Mr. Bosanquet the remark of the learned Dr. Hales, who closes his consideration of the matter with the following words:—"Thus are these inde-

* *Polymnia*, vii. 37.

pendent authors, Herodotus and Ctesias, hitherto at variance, not only reconciled to each other, but also rendered unintentional vouchers of the veracity of Holy Writ, and of that admirable philosophical historian Xenophon, and of the genuine fragments of Berosus" (l. iii. § 5). We may fairly conclude, therefore, from a comparison of Scripture with other authorities, that the following is a correct list of kings who possessed Babylon after the overthrow of Belshazzar, and reigned in the following order.

SCRIPTURE.	XENOPHON.	HERODOTUS.	THE BEHISTUN ROCK AND OTHER INSCRIPTIONS.
1. Darius the Mede.	Cyaxares II.		Cyaxares (from whom the rebel Phraortes claimed descent).
2. Cyrus.	Cyrus.	Cyrus.	Cyrus.
3. Ahasuerus.		Cambyses.	Cambyses.
4. Artaxerxes.		Smerdis.	Gomates.
5. Darius, King of Persia.		Darius, the son of Hystaspes.	Darius, the son of Hystaspes.

Mr. Bosanquet, however, considers "it is a question very difficult to decide when Belshazzar was slain, considering that this king is nowhere mentioned in profane history."^o I think this difficulty disappears when we compare Scripture with the canons and the inscriptions. It certainly appears, from Scripture, that there was a double mode of computing the seventy years' captivity; one, from the first year of Nebuchadnezzar to the first year of Darius the Mede (B.C. 608—538), according to Jeremiah and Daniel; the other, from the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, when he burnt the temple at Jerusalem, to the second year of Darius (Hystaspes) king of Persia (B.C. 590—520), according to the computation of Zachariah i. 1, 12. The distinction made in Scripture concerning these two computations is, that the latter refers to the desolation of the cities of Judah, the former to the punishment of the king of Babylon. For Jeremiah writing in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, foretells the desolation of the land of Judea, and the servitude of the nations for seventy years. "And it shall come to pass when seventy years are accomplished, saith the Lord, that I will *punish the king of Babylon*" (Jer. xxv. 1, 11, 12). It is surely impossible to interpret this of anything but the overthrow of Belshazzar, when his kingdom was given to "the Medes and Persians," and "Darius the Mede took his kingdom." Hence we understand the purport of the following Scripture—"In the first year of his (Darius the Mede) reign, I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem" (Dan. ix. 2).

That the canons support this view may be seen by the number of years that the kings of Babylon reigned during that period. Thus, Ptolemy's canon gives sixty-six years from the first of Nebuchadnezzar to the seventeenth, or last year of Nabonadius, when the punishment of the king of Babylon was accomplished. Berosus gives sixty-six years nine months for

the same period, recording the brief reign of Laborosoarchodus, which is omitted in that canon of Ptolemy. The ecclesiastical canon of Syncellus gives sixty-eight years for that interval. All these may be reconciled with Scripture by supposing that Nebuchadnezzar was taken into partnership with his father two or three years before his death, as was common in the East, and that Jeremiah dates the first year of his reign from that period. We may fairly conclude this was so from the language of Berosus, quoted by Josephus.^p Further, the difficulty of reconciling the Scripture account of Belshazzar's death with what is said by Berosus and Megasthenes respecting Cyrus having given Nabonnedus, or Nabannidochus as the latter writes the name, a principality in Carmania, has now been satisfactorily set at rest by Sir H. Rawlinson's decipherment of an inscription, wherein it appears that Nabonnedus admitted his son, Bel-shar-azar (Belshazzar), to a share of the government, and that Belshazzar, as joint king, shut himself up in Babylon, while the king his father took refuge elsewhere. Berosus says, "he was shut up in the city of Borsippus."^q This enables us to understand a difficult passage in Daniel, where the prophet is said to be made "the *third* ruler in the kingdom" (ver. 29) previous to the fall of Babylon. Nabonnedus in Borsippus being the first, Belshazzar second, and Daniel third.

Mr. Bosanquet in conclusion, observes that, "Daniel has marked, with extreme precision, the year of the accession of Darius to the throne of Babylon, by stating that he was then about 62 years of age, which was about the age of the only Darius known in history at that period, in B. c. 493."^r It may be shewn from Herodotus, that Darius Hystaspes could not have been more than 56 or 57 at that time; for the historian observes that he was "scarcely 20 years of age"^s at the time of Cyrus's death, B. c. 529, which would make him to be in the 57th year of his age, B. c. 493; or, to calculate in another way, as Herodotus dates the battle of Marathon (which happened B. c. 490), four years before the death of Darius Hystaspes,^t and gives thirty-six years for the length of his reign, by counting backwards to the death of Cyrus, and allowing for the reigns of Smerdis and Cambyses, we have this sum $32 + 8 + 20 = 60$, the age of Darius, B. c. 490; and, consequently, he must have been three years younger, or 57, B. c. 493.

Mr. Bosanquet continues, "speaking prophetically, that (viz. B. c. 493), I would prove to be seventy weeks of years, or 490 years before the coming of Messiah." Supposing that he refers to the famous prophecy of Dan. ix. 24—27, which is too lengthy a subject to enter upon now, I would remark, that even admitting that Christ was born B. c. 3 (it may be proved that he must have been born before that date, as Herod the Great was then dead), which is what Mr. Bosanquet would require in order to fulfil his interpretation of the "seventy weeks," *i. e.* 490 years having been completed at that date, the language of the prophecy requires that *the commencement* of the period should be dated from the decree for building

^p *Antiq.*, x., xi., 1, and *Contr.*, App. i. 19.

^q Joseph., *Con.*, App. l. i. § 20.

^r *J. S. L.* Oct. p. 167.

^s *Clio*, i. 209.

^t *Polymnia* vii. 1—4.

"the wall" of Jerusalem, and its *termination*, as regards the "cutting off" or crucifixion of the Messiah, after the "seven weeks and sixty-two weeks," i. e. 483 years after the decree was issued. I believe, after a lengthened investigation of this most important prophecy, that the only way in which this can be proved to have been accomplished, is from B. C. 454 (that date being, according to contemporaneous history, the twentieth of Artaxerxes, when permission to build "the wall" of Jerusalem was granted, Neh. chap. ii.) until A.D. 29, the true date of the crucifixion, which took place in the fifteenth year of the sole reign of Tiberius, and during the consulship of the Gemini.

Newport, Barnstaple,
Oct. 21st, 1847.

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,
BOURCHIER WREY SAVILE.

DR. CARL AUBERLEN AND ARTAXERXES LONGIMANUS.

I HAVE been lately reading the English^a translation of Dr. Carl Auberlen's valuable work on the *Prophecies of Daniel*. He agrees with many others in accepting 536 B.C. as the date of the edict of Cyrus (Ezra i. 1, 2) for the restoration of the Jews, and 520 B.C. as that of the edict of Darius Hystaspes for the completion of the work of rebuilding the temple (vi. 1, 12).

This able writer also thus explains (and doubtless correctly) the beginning of the eleventh chapter of Daniel: "The second verse concludes the series of the kings with Xerxes. For the three kings after Cyrus (in whose reign Daniel received the revelation) are Cambyses, Pseudosmerdis, and Darius Hystaspes. The fourth king is Xerxes."—p. 63.

I now proceed to cite our author's remarks on Ezra iv. 7, 22, where he identifies the Artaxerxes of Rehum and Shimshai with Artaxerxes Longimanus, the Son and successor of Xerxes. "The rebuilding of the city is expressly prohibited by the same Artaxerxes Longimanus, who afterwards granted it, owing to the slanderous reports of the Samaritans; *for^b it is not Smerdis, but Artaxerxes (Longimanus), who is meant in this passage*, and everywhere else in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, when the name of ~~smerdis~~ is introduced."—p. 117.

Now this assertion—that the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. 17, 22 is not Pseudosmerdis but Artaxerxes Longimanus—would seem directly to contradict the tenor of Ezra's narrative, where we find certain events apparently (not to say manifestly) recorded in their chronological order. (1.) Artaxerxes the king writes a letter to Samaria, in which he commands that the Jews be compelled to desist from their attempts to rebuild the city. (2.) Rehum and Shimshai, having received the letter, hasten to

^a *The Prophecies of Daniel, etc.*, by Carl August Auberlen. Translated by the Rev. Adolph Saphir.

^b The Italics are not in the original.

Jerusalem, and force the Jews to cease from their work. (3.) The Jews do not resume the work, which was thus interrupted in the reign of Artaxerxes, until the second year of Darius king of Persia. (4.) In the second year of Darius (Haggai i. 1; Zech. i. 1), the Jews, encouraged by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, resume the task of rebuilding the house of God.

Surely, if language can have any ascertainable meaning, the reader of Ezra is constrained to believe that king Artaxerxes wrote his well-known letter to Rehum and Shimshai before the Persian sceptre passed into the hands of the Darius of Ezra iv. 24. Now Auberlen rightly believes this Darius to be the Son of Hystaspes. For he elsewhere says—referring to Ezra vi. 15—"The building of the temple was completed in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspes," who was the grandfather of Longimanus. Are we not compelled to understand Ezra as expressly teaching (iv. 23, 24, and v. 12) that the Jews resumed, in the second year of Darius Hystaspes, that same work of rebuilding the temple from which they had been *previously* compelled to desist by Rehum and Shimshai, in obedience to the letter of king Artaxerxes? And if so, must we not hesitate to believe that this Artaxerxes was the grandson of the Darius of Ezra iv. 24?

We are left to conjecture for ourselves Auberlen's reasons for peremptorily putting upon Ezra's narrative an interpretation so contrary to its obvious tenor and meaning. We may feel assured that this thoughtful writer would not hastily take such a step. He may perhaps have come to the conclusion that the recorded events of secular history render it almost impossible to identify the Artaxerxes of whom we are speaking with Pseudosmerdis, the shortlived successor of Cambyses. For, according to Herodotus, the Magian usurper and impostor reigned about seven months—a period apparently too brief, when we consider the distance between Persia and Samaria, to permit our crowding into its narrow limits all that is mentioned in Ezra iv. 7—24. So far as the length of his reign is concerned, we might identify Cambyses with this Artaxerxes; but this cannot be admitted, as we may be almost certain that the king Ahasuerus of Ezra iv. 6 is Cambyses. At all events, as the book of Ezra now stands, it would be offering great violence to its language and arrangement, should we identify with Artaxerxes Longimanus the Artaxerxes who wrote to Rehum and Shimshai—unless, indeed, we also identify, as some do, the Darius of chap. iv. 24, with Darius Nothus the son of Artaxerxes Longimanus. But Auberlen, as we have seen above, would justly reject such a view as inadmissible, being persuaded that the Artaxerxes of Ezra vii. 1 is the same as the Artaxerxes of Nehemiah, and identical with Longimanus the son and successor of Xerxes, and father of Darius Nothus.

There is another possible, though improbable hypothesis, if we would follow Auberlen's view of the chronology of Ezra iv. 7—22. It is certain that there are instances of incorrect chronological arrangement in our present copies of Jeremiah. And every reader of the Bible is aware that the seventh and eighth chapters of Daniel, containing events which occurred in the reign of Belshazzar, are placed immediately after the two which relate the death of Belshazzar and the conspiracy against Daniel in

the first year of Darius the Mede. Should we, then, be determined to think that the Artaxerxes of Ezra's fourth chapter is the same personage as the Artaxerxes of the seventh, it would seem necessary to believe that Ezra iv. 7—23 has been accidentally misplaced, and that these verses ought to be removed from the position which they now occupy, in order to form the end of the sixth, or the beginning of the seventh chapter. Although it is very far more probable, under all the circumstances, that an erroneous arrangement of paragraphs should be found in the books of Jeremiah and Daniel, who wrote in times of trouble and exile, than in the historical work of Ezra.

Yet, if we are inclined to concede that there really is in Ezra the incorrect arrangement of which we are speaking, it may be well to remember that this very concession would of itself introduce an apparently insurmountable difficulty in the explanation of the twenty-fourth verse of the fourth chapter. The twenty-third tells us that in consequence of the letter of king Artaxerxes, "Rehum and Shimshai went up in haste to Jerusalem unto the Jews, and made them to cease by force and power. (24) Then (אָנָּךְ) ceased the work of (בֵּית־יְהוָה) the house of God which is at Jerusalem. And it ceased unto the second year of the reign of Darius king of Persia." It is important to our purpose to remark that the initial word "then" of the twenty-fourth verse does not represent the indefinite particle (ו), but the Chaldee אָנָּךְ,^c which is equivalent to the Hebrew אָנָּךְ, or the Greek τότε. The very close connexion between the twenty-third and twenty-fourth verses is still more definitely marked by the prefixed (ב), the literal translation being very near akin to "*at that time* ceased the work of the house of God," &c. It is thus far plain beyond reasonable doubt, that, according to our present copies of Ezra, the letter of king Artaxerxes, which we read in the fourth of Ezra, was certainly written and sent to Samaria some little time at least *before* the second year of Darius,^d and doubtless, before the accession of Darius to the throne of Persia. It is as impossible to separate Ezra iv. 23, 24, as it would be to separate vi. 12, 13, where we read (12), "I, Darius, have made a decree, let it be done with speed. (13) Then (אָנָּךְ) Tatnai, Shethar-boznai, and their companions, according to that which Darius the king had sent, so they did speedily."

It is absolutely necessary to notice yet more particularly this important clause in iv. 24—"Then ceased the *work of* (בֵּית־יְהוָה) the house of God"—for the correct interpretation of בֵּית־יְהוָה will go far to disprove Auberlen's hypothesis. Are we to explain it of the religious service and ministry of the temple? in which sense the term in question is certainly used in

^c A similar intimate connexion, marked by the same Chaldee word, exists between Ezra v. 17 and vi. 1—(17). "Let there be search made in the king's treasure-house in Babylon . . . and let the king send his pleasure to us concerning this matter" (vi. 1). "Then (אָנָּךְ) Darius the king made a decree, and search was made in the house of the rolls, where the treasures were laid up in Babylon." The simple אָנָּךְ, without the ב, is similarly used Dan. ii. 25, etc.

^d We have seen that Auberlen fully believes this Darius to be the son of Hystaspes.

vi. 18, "And they set the priests in their divisions, and the Levites in their courses, for the service of (עֲבָדָה) God, which is at Jerusalem." We at once reply, Assuredly not. For that "work of the house of God" which Rehum and Shimshai interrupted and caused to cease, was evidently similar in kind to the work which was resumed under the auspices of Haggai and Zechariah in the second year of Darius. But this latter work was manifestly the resumption and continuance of the building operations of the yet unfinished second temple. Besides, the public worship and service of the temple were not even mentioned in Artaxerxes' royal letter, which Rehum would of course shew to the rulers of the Jews to prove his right to interfere even forcibly, should resistance be offered. We are, therefore, not at liberty to suppose that the result of king Artaxerxes' letter was to cause the Jews to desist from the public daily worship of God at the altar which had been erected by Joshua and Zerubbabel (iii. 2), most probably within the limits of the site of Solomon's temple.

There is further proof of the absurdity of supposing that there is any allusion to the religious service of the temple in iv. 24. We have certainly seen that עֲבָדָה is used of such religious service; is it also used of the manual labours of those who are occupied in building the temple? Yes: we read in v. 8, "The house of the great God is being built with great stones, and timber is being laid in the walls, and *this work* (עֲבָדָה) goeth fast on, and prospereth in their hands." And, again, Darius writes (vi. 7), "Let *the work* of (עֲבָדָה) this house of God alone; let the governor of the Jews and the elders of the Jews build this house of God in his place." Hence, it would seem to be an indubitable inference from iv. 23, 24, that when, in obedience to the letter of Artaxerxes, Rehum and Shimshai hastened to Jerusalem, *they found the Jews occupied in rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem.* The material structure of the temple was therefore still in an unfinished state (a fact which of itself is sufficient to overthrow Auberlen's hypothesis), and consequently the letter of Artaxerxes and the journey of Rehum and Shimshai were earlier than the second year of Darius, when the Jews resumed the interrupted work of rebuilding of the temple, and carried it forward until its completion in the sixth year of that Darius whom Auberlen allows to be the son of Hystaspes. Thus, if we take Auberlen's view of this Darius, and of the Coresh of Ezra i. 1, 2—viz., that the former was the son of Hystaspes, and the latter, the great Cyrus, father of Cambyses—we seem compelled to conclude (unless we can suppose Ezra iv. 23, 24 to have been altered or interpolated) that the king Artaxerxes, who sent Rehum to Jerusalem, reigned over Persia *after* the great Cyrus, and *before* Darius Hystaspes, and that the Artaxerxes of the fourth of Ezra was certainly not Longimanus the son and successor of Xerxes, and grandson of Darius Hystaspes.

How then could Auberlen venture to assume as unquestionably true that the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. was Artaxerxes Longimanus, whose reign did not commence until about fifty years after the completion of the temple in the sixth year of Darius Hystaspes.

The late Duke of Manchester (I quote from memory), in a paper in this Journal, takes for granted that the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. must be

identical with the Artaxerxes of Ezra vii., and of Nehemiah, because the letter of complaint against the Jews from Rehum and Shimshai "to Artaxerxes the king," *makes no mention whatever of the house of God*, but speaks only of the rebuilding^e of the city and its walls. "Be it known unto the king, that the Jews which came up from thee to us are come unto Jerusalem, building the rebellious and bad city, and have set up the walls thereof, and joined the foundations." The Duke of Manchester would infer from the omission of all allusion to the house of God, that the temple must have already been completed, and that, therefore, this letter must be understood as describing a state of things subsequent to the reign of Darius Hystaspes.

Now, if this royal letter were a perfectly isolated historical fragment, with no preceding or succeeding context, it might not seem unreasonable to gather from the omission of any mention of the house of God, that, most probably, the work of rebuilding the temple had been already completed, and that this letter was written to one of Darius's royal successors, when the Jews were endeavouring, without his permission, to rebuild the walls of their city. Nor is the language of the king's reply to be overlooked, as perhaps both Auberlen and the Duke of Manchester may have laid some stress upon it: "Give ye now commandment to cause these men to cease, and that this city be not builded *until commandment shall be given from me*" (iv. 21). This passage may fairly be thought to favour the idea that this king did afterwards expressly permit the rebuilding of the city and walls of Jerusalem, and that Nehemiah recorded this permission in his second chapter, *i. e.*, that the Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. was Longimanus.

But against all this are we not positively forbidden by the clear language of authentic Jewish history to entertain such a view. Is it not manifest from Ezra's words—"then ceased *the work of the house of God*"—that, *when Rehum harshly interposed, the Jews were earnestly engaged in the work of rebuilding the temple*. If others may found arguments on Rehum's silence about the temple, may we not also draw inferences from Ezra's exclusive mention of the temple, and think it very probable that, at the time of Rehum's unfriendly visit, the manual labours of the Jews were almost, if not altogether, confined to the task of rebuilding the temple, and that the erection of the walls was as yet but a secondary affair; especially as in the^f second year of Darius the public efforts of the Jews were concentrated upon the work of the temple.

^e If the Jews, at the time of Rehum's complaint against them, were engaged heartily in rebuilding the city wall, it must have arisen from their own national and patriotic zeal, without the solicitations and encouragements of such prophets as Haggai and Zechariah. Yet, if we carefully study the first two chapters of Nehemiah, we shall feel how improbable it is that any such national or patriotic zeal was influencing the Jews, from the first to the twentieth year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and that nothing short of such extraordinary interposition as that of Nehemiah could have aroused the reluctant spirit of the Jews to undertake the task of rebuilding the city wall. Hence it seems very probable that Rehum did not write in the reign of Longimanus, and that his statement that the Jews were then busied in rebuilding their walls was very exaggerated, if not altogether false.

^f As Cyrus had commanded the Jews to rebuild the temple, and the decree of

It may be objected that, apparently strong as is the language of Ezra, it scarcely warrants us altogether to set aside *two* such documents as the letter of Rehum and Shimshai, and the royal epistle of Artaxerxes. This objection will be very much weakened by closer examination. Far removed from Jerusalem, king Artaxerxes could know nothing of the proceedings of his Jewish subjects there, except through the communications of his officials in Samaria. The letter of Artaxerxes is therefore merely the echo to that of Rehum, and is of no force in this part of our discussion. The simple question is, Shall we follow the letter of Rehum, or the narrative of Ezra?

We are, of course, to bear in mind that the epistle from Rehum and Shimshai was written by bitter and malignant enemies of the Jews, who, bent upon harassing them, and preventing the rebuilding of the temple, would not scrupulously regard the truth in their communications to their royal master. Had these two officials been upright and honourable men, free from all prejudice and ill will towards the Jews, and on whose report we could rely as a candid and correct description of the real state of things at Jerusalem, there might be some ground for inferring from their silence that, the temple having been already completed under Darius, the task of restoring the walls was now proceeding with heart and hand. But there is an obvious reason why the letter in question should contain such statements as are found in it, even if they were grossly exaggerated or wholly untrue. For if these hostile officials had described the Jews as merely occupied in rebuilding their national temple, the far distant monarch of the vast Persian Empire might possibly have thought such a matter almost beneath his serious notice. Accordingly, Rehum and Shimshai, by making no allusion to the temple, representing the Jews as engaged in restoring the fortifications of their city, and insisting upon the seditious and rebellious character of Jerusalem in former times, for confirmation of which they appeal to the Persian archives, succeeded in awakening the political jealousy of their sovereign, and thus effectually obtained the object which they really had in view. This was to force the Jews to cease from their attempts to rebuild the house of God.

We cannot close this part of our discussion without also noticing the earlier portion of the fourth chapter of Ezra, where we find the returned Jews occupied in rebuilding, not the walls, but the temple, of Jerusalem. All this was in strict conformity to the decree of Cyrus, which, though it did not forbid the restoration of the wall, expressly commanded the returned Jews "to build the house of the Lord God of Israel (he is the God) which is in Jerusalem" (i. 3). Yet even before the death of Cyrus "the people of the land (the semipagan descendants of the Assyrian colonists) weakened the hands of the people of Judah, and troubled them in building" (iv. 4). Can we doubt for a moment that this work of "building," in the carrying forward of which the Jews were troubled and hindered by their malignant neighbours, had very especial reference to

Artaxerxes merely prohibited the rebuilding of the city, when the Jews resumed the work of rebuilding the temple in the second of Darius they were guilty of no breach of the commands of those Persian sovereigns.

the house of God? And we learn the inveterate determination of these hostile colonists, when we find it immediately added that "they hired counsellors against the Jews to frustrate their purpose,^g all the days of Cyrus king of Persia, even until the days of Darius king of Persia." The purpose thus sought to be frustrated during the interval between Cyrus and Darius, we may reasonably believe to have been chiefly, not to say exclusively, the rebuilding of the house of God. Accordingly, it is not letters of complaint from Samaritan adversaries, but the last-cited verse as here explained together with the twenty-fourth verse, which may be fairly regarded as the true key to the right interpretation of that portion of Ezra's history which extends from iv. 6 to v. 17. We there read of Samaritan opposition, after the death of Cyrus, to the erection of the second temple—first under Ahasuerus (iv.), next under Artaxerxes, and lastly under Darius Hystaspes. We seem, therefore, fully justified in concluding against Auberlen, that this Artaxerxes, who was one of the predecessors of Darius, cannot be identified with Longimanus.

Now we have seen that this writer holds that Ezra i. 4 refers to a decree of Cyrus the Great in 536 B.C., and also that Ezra vi. 6—12 contains a decree of Darius Hystaspes in 520 B.C. We may feel assured that Auberlen believes that Cyrus died in 529 B.C., and that the Ahasuerus of iv. 6, and the Artaxerxes of iv. 7, were sovereigns of the vast Persian Empire, which included within its boundaries Babylon, Samaria, and Judæa. But these two monarchs reigned between 529 B.C. and 521 B.C. (for the decree of Ezra vi. 6, 12, was not earlier than the *second* year of Darius Hystaspes), and Herodotus teaches us that there were two, and only two, Persian monarchs between the great Cyrus and Darius Hystaspes—Cambyses and the Pseudo-smerdis. According, therefore, to our present copies of Ezra and Herodotus, the Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes of the former are to be identified with the Cambyses and Pseudo-smerdis of the latter.

Without at all touching the question of inspiration, we may say that, in discussing the narrative of the official intercourse between the Persian Court and Samaria and Jerusalem, down to the very titles assumed by the Persian sovereigns in their public letters to their officers in Samaria, the authority of Ezra is superior to that of Herodotus. These two writers, however, do not necessarily contradict each other. The latter tells us that the Magian impostor, who immediately preceded Darius Hystaspes, declared himself to be Smerdis, the younger son of the great Cyrus. This is not inconsistent with the fact that he chose to call himself Artaxerxes in all his public edicts, and to be addressed by that title in all communications from provincial governors and officers of the state. About two hundred years after the usurpation of Pseudo-smerdis, Bessus, having murdered Darius Codomannus, assumed the royal title of Artaxerxes. In European kingdoms, where serious changes in manners and customs take place within a hundred years, we could not so reasonably infer from the later the probability of the earlier, as in ancient Persian

^g This verse may be regarded as a sort of summary of Ezra iv. 7—24.

history. Hence the fact that Bessus assumed the regal title of Artaxerxes makes it quite an admissible idea that Pseudo-smerdis may have taken for himself some such royal appellation.

The name of the great Cyrus had been rendered so illustrious, that he may well have preferred it to any ostentatious oriental title. Cambyses, whose pride amounted to almost a kind of madness, had no such motive to reject the high-sounding appellations of Ahasuerus or Artaxerxes, whether proceeding from his own mind, or suggested and urged by the voice of flatterers. There is, therefore, little, if indeed any, difficulty, so far as the difference of name is concerned, in our believing the Ahasuerus and Artaxerxes of Ezra iv. to be the Cambyses and Pseudo-smerdis of Herodotus.

Lastly, Herodotus has been supposed (and very reasonably) to mark, by the period of seven months, the interval between the death of Cambyses and the slaying of Pseudo-smerdis by the conspirators. This leaves us at liberty (without offering violence to the narrative of the father of history) to suppose that the magian may have proclaimed himself as Smerdis, the younger son of Cyrus, have seized the Persian throne, and assumed the royal title of Artaxerxes, two, or even three, months before the decease of Cambyses. This would extend his possession of supreme power at the Persian Court from seven to nine or ten months—a period sufficiently long to contain all that is recorded in Ezra vi. 7—23.

27th October.

G. B.

THE ADDRESS OF LAMECH, GENESIS IV. 23, 24.

SIR,—I believe it has been generally considered, by commentators, that the address of Lamech to his wives, in Genesis iv. 23, 24, is beset with peculiar difficulties, and this must frequently be the case in a document of such high antiquity, where so much is brief and fragmentary. Perhaps, however, some examination of the Hebrew text may serve to elucidate the subject. It may be as well first to give the translation in the Authorized Version, and then notice some of the comments which have been made upon it.

“And Lamech said unto his wives, Adah and Zillah, hear my voice; ye wives of Lamech, hearken unto my speech: for I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt. If Cain shall be avenged sevenfold, truly Lamech seventy and sevenfold.”

Rosenmüller in his *Scholia* says, “Ceterum apparet hæc verba a Mose ex quodam carmine antiquo inserta esse.” Caunter in his work on the *Poetry of the Pentateuch*, speaks of it as “the most ancient specimen of Hebrew poetry now known.” That it displays much depth or imagination we moderns will hardly be prepared to admit, though, as far as structure is concerned, the words “I have slain a man to my wounding, and a young man to my hurt,” have quite an Homeric cadence in the original Hebrew. This may be merely accidental, for rhythmical lines are to be

met with in the production of every age, such as in the New Testament, the first portion of James i. 17. Be this as it may, the words evidently refer to some fact "out" of the usual order of events which Moses was recording. Bishop Kidder observes, "the occasion of this speech of Lamech's not being revealed, it cannot be reasonably expected that any man should positively determine the full sense of it." This is not a very encouraging sentiment, but it ought not to have much weight in a critical age. Bishop Patrick's interpretation is, that one of Lamech's sons having discovered the use of weapons, his wives were apprehensive lest some one should make use of them to slay him. But he bids them take comfort, "for he had never slain any one, and therefore if God guarded Cain so strongly, who was a murderer, a much more inexorable vengeance would pursue him who should slay me, being a guiltless person."

Lamech's wives (as I shall afterwards endeavour to shew) might fear lest some bodily injury should be offered him, but his proffered consolation, that they "need not fear, because he had never slain any one," is contradictory to any possible meaning of the text. Assuming, then, that Lamech was not guiltless of some fatal act, the following explanation has sometimes been given. "I have slain a man, a crime of much deeper dye than that of my progenitor Cain, because it is the second instance of the commission of murder, and because the displeasure of the Almighty has been distinctly pronounced on him. That crime had, in his case, been punished, not by death, but by a lengthened life, rendered bitter by the greatest remorse. If, then (for the sake of punishment), Cain's life was guarded by sevenfold vengeance pronounced on any one who should slay him, shall not a much greater measure of vengeance await him who shall slay me, who have been guilty of a much more heinous crime."

The obvious reply to this interpretation would be, that though the Almighty was pleased to protect the first murderer from the natural and immediate consequences of his crime, and to set him up as a living example, or warning, to be abhorred by all others; yet there seems not the slightest reason to suppose that if Lamech had been the second murderer he would have been treated in the same manner. Had this been the case it would, in the course of time, have become a perpetual premium on the crime of murder. The *Paraphrase* of Onkelos, quoted by Rosenmüller, seems to disavow the crime altogether, taking ה as a negative. "Non occidi virumcujus causâ ego putarer peccator neque juvenem interemi cuius causâ perderetur semen meum."

Let us now turn to the original text. "I have slain a man (וָאִישׁ) to my wounding," Authorized Version, but according to Gesenius, "propter vulnus mihi inflictum," the ה being here understood as implying "on account of," which seems borne out by Leviticus xix. 28, "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh (לְנֶפֶשׁ) for the dead," Authorized Version, that is "on account" of the dead, and so rendered by Luther "um eines Todten willen." So, also, in the next phrase, "and a young man (וְיָעָר) 'to' or 'on account' of my hurt," וְיָעָר signifying "vibex, plagarum vestigium lividum in cute remanens." Will not the original signify, "I have slain a young man on account of 'my being wounded,' and a young man on

account of 'my being severely bruised?'” If this interpretation be correct, it would imply that Lamech had been engaged in some struggle with two persons, either separately or simultaneously, had been violently assaulted and wounded, and had slain them in self-defence. His offence, or defence, was not murder, but manslaughter; and the reasoning would be, “If Cain, after he had slain a brother, without provocation, was protected by the Almighty who threatened death to any one attempting the destruction of that signal offender, much more should he, Lamech, be protected, who had only been guilty of an act of justifiable homicide.” If, he would rightly argue, the murderer of Cain shall be punished sevenfold, certainly he who should destroy me would justly be punished in a seventy and sevenfold degree. This, indeed, seems a fair mode of reasoning, for if Lamech had really been guilty of murder, why should he have been protected from the consequences of it?

There is, probably, an ellipsis of some preceding speech or circumstance, which if known, would account for the energy with which Lamech addresses his wives, Adah and Zillah. “Hear my voice, ye wives of Lamech; hearken unto my speech.” It might be probable that in the antediluvian ages the nearest of kin to a murdered person conceived that he had a right to revenge his death by taking away the life of the perpetrator of the deed, whether done intentionally or not. In such a case Lamech would naturally endeavour to reassure, as much as possible, the minds of his wives, by placing before them the equity of the Almighty in his dealings with his progenitor and himself.

It tells hard upon human nature that immediately after the mention of Lamech's son, Tubal Cain, as “an instructor of every artificer in brass and iron,” we find the application of these metals to instruments of destruction!

I do not know whether my attempt to elucidate these two verses will satisfy your readers, but I trust it may have thrown some little light upon this “vexata quæstio.”

Cheltenham,
Oct. 26th, 1857.

I remain, Sir, yours faithfully,
H. P.

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF SOME PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

SIR,—During the last few years I have devoted a good deal of time to the study of the Scriptures in the original languages; partly to ascertain their exact sense, partly with a view to the elucidation of Milton's poetry. While pursuing this study, I seemed to myself to have discovered the exact meaning of some passages, which, as far as I am aware, had eluded the acumen and vigilance of preceding enquirers, and of the critics in general; and as I hold it to be the duty of every one who has arrived at knowledge, especially if it seem to be of importance, to communicate it, if a suitable medium is to be found, I take this opportunity of laying before

the world these supposed discoveries of mine, in the confident expectation that, as they are advanced without arrogance, they will be received and treated with candour, and be maturely considered before they are rejected.

I commence with the Hebrew preposition א , of which the primary sense is *in*, but which, like all the other prepositions, has a variety of other senses more or less connected with the primary one. Of these, the one to which I now wish to call attention is, *to*, *unto*, *toward*, the use of which seems to be more extensive than is usually supposed. Gesenius, of course, notices this sense, but he lays no great stress on it; in fact, he gives but one example, and that (Gen. xi. 4) one in which there is no verb. My position is, that this is the usual sense of א after verbs of motion, and this sense has been rightly given by our version in the following instances: "We took sweet counsel together, and walked *unto* (א) the house of God in company" (Psalm lv. 14); "They shall come up *to* (א) the mount" (Ex. xix. 13); "Woe unto them that join house *to* (א) house, that lay field *to* (א) field" (Isa. v. 8). To these I think may be added, "To come *into* (א) the mountain of the Lord, *to* (א) the mighty one of Israel" (Isa. xxx. 29). I say this may be added, because *into*, which is peculiar to the English Version, is here and elsewhere equivalent with *unto*. In effect, "*into* the mountain," in this connexion, using *into* in its ordinary sense, would give a totally wrong meaning to the passage. It may also be noticed that the proper signification of the word (אבן) rendered "Mighty One" is "rock," which, perhaps, makes the use of א (which is exactly synonymous with א after verbs of motion) the more appropriate.

When we consider these two prepositions thus in conjunction, we may be able to give a more exact sense to "and brought me thither, in (א) the visions of God brought he me *into* (אבן) the land of Israel" (Ezek. xl. 1, 2), and the similar passage, Ezek. viii. 3. Here it will be seen we have א and אבן together, and the latter rendered *into*, i. e., *unto*; and further אבן , *vision*, has only two significations, viz., the act of looking, and the object looked on, of which, only the latter applies here; and as the prophet could not see the objects till he came to where they were, I think that here also *to* is the proper sense of א : "He brought me *to* visions of God." The use of the plural also seems to confirm this rendering, as he saw several objects when brought to the land of Israel.

Ezek. xi. 24 may seem to present some difficulty; but the passage is rather obscure and the reading of the Septuagint is different.

As it thus plainly appears that א does, at least may, signify *to*, after verbs of motion, it is surely consonant with the laws of grammar and logic to suppose that, when joined with אמצע , *middle*, *centre*, following one of these verbs, the meaning may be, *to the middle*, i. e., *direct*, *straight to*. This simple principle will, I think, clear the following passages, which have been hitherto somewhat obscure.

"And Moses went *into the midst* (אמצע) of the cloud, and gat him up *into* (אבן) the mount" (Ex. xxiv. 18).

Here there is an evident hysteron-proteron: for the cloud was on

the top of the mount. I would render it, according to our idiom, "And Moses went *straight to* the cloud, going up the mount," and all becomes clear and simple.

"Saul put the people in three companies, and they came *into the midst* (מִן) of the host in the morning watch" (1 Sam. xi. 4).

This place is certainly not very clear, but it will become so if we take *came into the midst* in the same sense as I have taken the same words in the preceding verse of Exodus. The *camp* (for so it should be, not *host*) of the Ammonites was, like all others, four-square, and one of its sides was of course next the besieged town. Saul, then, attacked it on the other three sides, each division making direct for the centre, *i. e.*, assailing the middle of the side to which it was opposed, and all then met in the centre.

"And they went up into the city; [and] when they were come *into* (מִן) the city, behold Samuel came out against them . . . then Saul drew nigh to Samuel *in* (מִן) the gate" (1 Sam. ix. 14—18).

This place, it will be seen, is very incorrectly rendered, the translators evidently wishing to elude the difficulty which they thought they saw; for if Saul was already in the interior of the city, how could he meet Samuel in the gate? Yet this apparently insurmountable difficulty vanishes the moment we give מִן the sense which we have seen that it has after verbs of motion, and translate "And they went up to the city," "*going direct to* the city." In this way Saul could easily meet Samuel *in* the gateway, or it may be, as I shall shew, *before* or outside of it. Will it be believed that the only way in which Thenius, the latest commentator on the Books of Samuel, has been able to get over this imaginary difficulty is by reading *gate* for *city* after the first מִן? and that Ewald could only elude it by saying that, as the city was small, "in the middle of the town does not differ much from in the middle of the gate?" The Septuagint, it may also be observed, reads πόλεως in ver. 18, but the original reading may have been πύλης, which some transcriber took to be an error, as no gate had been mentioned in the preceding text. It is further to be observed that מִן occurs in two different senses; but this is only an ordinary usage of the Hebrew writers, connected with their fondness for Paronomasia: so in the blessings of Jacob and Esau (Gen. xxvii.) ב is in the former *with*, and in the latter *without*. On this principle also I should feel inclined to understand the eating of butter and honey in Isa. vii., taking it in ver. 15 to denote the peace and security, in ver. 22, the desolation of the land. Finally, judging by the ear, I suspect that מִן may have dropped out in 1 Sam. ix. 14, and that it was originally "and they went up the hill to the city," as in ver. 11.

But מִן seems to be used with other verbs in a different sense, and one which may have had no small influence on the language of the New Testament. That sense is *before, directly opposite*; and perhaps the best illustration of it may be made from the use of its translation ἐν μέσῳ, in the following places of the Apocalypse:—

"And I beheld, and, lo, *in the midst* (ἐν μέσῳ) of the throne and of the four beasts, and *in the midst* (ἐν μέσῳ) of the elders, stood a Lamb"

(v. 6). "For the Lamb which is *in the midst* (ἐν μέσῳ) of the throne shall feed them" (viii. 17).

The throne and the seats of the four and twenty elders must be understood as forming a semicircle, within which the lamb stood, *directly before* the throne; just as in iv. 6 it is said, "and *in the midst* (ἐν μέσῳ) of the throne, and round about the throne, were four beasts;" for as these four beasts (ζῶα) are evidently the "four living creatures" which in Ezekiel bear the firmament on which was the throne of God (*i.e.*, the sea of glass of the Apocalypse), which was quadrilateral, we may suppose that they stood one on each side of it, so that one was *directly opposite* (ἐν μέσῳ) the throne. I will now try to shew that this sense of ἐν μέσῳ is justified by that of תְּרָא in some places in the Old Testament.

"Because ye trespassed against me *among* (תְּרָא) the children of Israel at (א) the waters of Meribah" (Deut. xxx. 51).

Now if we look at the narrative in Num. xx. 10, 11, we shall see that the children of Israel were gathered *before* the rock whence Moses brought the water, so that he was *in presence* of, and not *among*, them.

"By the rivers of Babylon, there we sat down . . . we hanged our harps upon the willows *in the midst thereof* (תְּרָא)" (Psalm cxxxvii. 1).

Here "the rivers" is used in a sense common to the Hebrew with the Greek and Latin, namely, the plural being employed to denote one of them (comp. Judges xii. 7). They sat by a willowy stream, and surely the place where the willows grew was the bank, and not the midst of the water. I would render then, "upon the willows [which were] *along it*."

"The hand of the Lord was upon me, and carried me . . . and set me down *in the midst* (תְּרָא) of the valley which was full of bones, and caused me to pass by them round about" (Ezek. xxxvii. 1, 2).

The word (תְּרָא) rendered here "valley" also signifies "a small plain" (in which sense it, or rather its Arabic congener, is the origin of the Spanish *Vega*), and it is so rendered here by Septuagint, Vulgate, and Luther, and these two last make the prophet walk over the bones, while our translators (and perhaps the Septuagint), with what I may perhaps term an instinct of propriety, make him go round about them on the outside; for Ezekiel, being a priest, would have been defiled by contact with the bones of dead men, and it would besides have been highly unbecoming to have him trampling on the bones which were so soon to be animated. This translation is in perfect accordance with the original, and if it was on the outside that the prophet went round, he must have been placed in front and not in the midst of the valley.

We have seen that ἐν μέσῳ and ἀνὰ μέσον are the same in signification; the same, I think, may be asserted of תְּרָא and תְּרָאֵהוּ. It appears to me, then, that the context will shew that in "I will assemble them *into the midst* (תְּרָאֵהוּ) of this city" (Jer. xxi. 4), we should read, "*before* this city;" for the pestilence mentioned in the next verse could only have occurred during the siege.

"And it was [so], when they came *into the midst* (תְּרָאֵהוּ) of the city, that Ishmael the son of Nethaniah slew them, [and cast them] *into the midst* (תְּרָאֵהוּ) of the pit" (Jer. xli. 7).

We may see that *and cast them* is an unauthorized addition of the translator's. Luther, I think correctly, renders the latter part, *bei dem Brunnen*, and I would render the whole, "when they came *before* the city. Ishmael slew them *before* (*i. e.*, on the side of) the pit;" for the probability seems to be that this pit was outside of the city.

I will now consider some of the other places in the New Testament in which I deem that *ἐν μέσῳ* should be rendered *before*.

"But when Herod's birthday was kept, the daughter of Herodias danced *before* [them] (*ἐν μέσῳ*)" (Matt. xiv. 6).

Here it is very remarkable that though the Vulgate has *in medio*, not only our own translators, but Luther and William Salisbury, the first Welsh translator, render *ἐν μέσῳ* *before*, and supply *them* (*αὐτῶν*). It is plain that this must be the true sense; for as the tables at which the guests lay were at the upper end of the room, she must have danced in the space between them and the door, that is, *before* the guests.

"They found him in the temple sitting *in the midst* (*ἐν μέσῳ*) of the doctors, both hearing them, and asking them questions" (Luke ii. 46).

So far as I have been able to ascertain, the practice among the Jews was, for the doctors to sit on raised seats, and the pupils to sit *before* them on lower seats, or on the ground. This will have been exactly described here, if we render *ἐν μέσῳ* as in the preceding passage.

"And as they thus spake, Jesus himself stood *in the midst* of them" (Luke xxiv. 36).

The orientals, it is well known, always sit when in a house, and we must therefore suppose that the disciples were sitting in the usual manner on the divans by the walls. It must then have been *before* them that Jesus appeared. It has, by the way, always appeared strange to me, that while the Church of Rome makes such use of John xx. 19, 26 in defence of transubstantiation, it does not seem to have occurred to any one that a miraculous opening and closing of the doors is not excluded by the language of the narrative; or that it is apparently the house-door that is meant.

"Is it so, that there is not a wise man among you? No, not one that shall be able to judge *between his brethren*" (*ἀνὰ μέσον τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ*) 1 Cor. vi. 5.

This is evidently an incorrect translation, and no commentary that I have seen has succeeded in explaining the passage. As the judge and the party were opposite each other, render *ἀνὰ μέσον* *before, in presence of*, and the difficulty nearly vanishes.

In like manner may be explained Acts i. 15; iv. 7; Col. ii. 14; 2 Thes. ii. 7; and other places. I would also so explain John viii. 3, 9; supplying *αὐτοῦ*, not *λαόν*, after *ἐν μέσῳ*.

I now return to *ἐν*, and shall consider two places where it occurs in connexion with the preposition *ἐν*. "And it came to pass, when Moses went out unto the tabernacle, that all the people rose up, and stood every man at his tent door, and looked after Moses, *until he was gone into* the tabernacle. And it came to pass, as Moses *entered into* the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended, and stood at the door of the tabernacle, and [the Lord] talked with Moses. . . And the Lord spake unto Moses, face to face, as a man speaketh unto his friend. And he turned again into the camp: but his servant Joshua

... departed not *out of* (יָצָא) the tabernacle" (Ex. xxxiii. 8—11). With this translation, which I hold to be incorrect, agree the Vulgate and Luther, and perhaps the Septuagint; I am not acquainted with the more modern versions and commentaries. But it is very remarkable that the excellent Welsh version (that of Bishop Morgan in 1588, I presume) gives what I regard as the true sense of the passage.

"And looked after Moses until *he came to* the tabernacle. And when Moses *went to* the tabernacle, the cloudy pillar descended . . . but Joshua departed not *from* the tabernacle."

Any one acquainted with Hebrew will see that the Scripture does not say that Moses went *into* the tabernacle. How, in fact, could he? when the master of the house came, as it were, and stood at (*i. e.*, outside of) the door to speak with him. And if *he* did not go in, how could Joshua? I take, therefore, יָצָא here to be, *i. q.*, יָצָא (as יָצָא is, *i. q.*, יָצָא) and to be understood in the sense of *before*. It would, in effect, have been contrary to the whole Mosaic economy if Joshua (who was not of the tribe of Levi) were to have entered the tabernacle. He was left, we may presume, to receive any further commands from the dweller of the cloud.

"And the glory of the Lord went up *from the midst* (מִתְּוֶחֱ) of the city, and stood upon the mountain which is on the east side of the city" (Ezek. xi. 23).

In chap. x. 19 we are told that the glory rose from the threshold of the temple and "stood *at the door* (מִן־הַדֶּלֶת) of the east gate of the Lord's house." Now, as I shall shew, *at the door* means *outside of*, and the east gate, if I mistake not, is the east gate of the outer court of the temple. I further am inclined to think (for I have seen no proof of the contrary) that the city wall did not run along Mount Moriah eastwards of the temple, that of the temple being the only defence on this side. In this case מִן־הַדֶּלֶת here would be equivalent to יָצָא or יָצָא elsewhere, and like it to be understood in the sense of *before*.

I have said that מִן־הַדֶּלֶת, or simply מִן־הַדֶּלֶת, signifies *at*, *i. e.*, *outside of* the door. In proof of this I would refer to such places as Judges ix. 35; xviii. 16; Jer. i. 15; xix. 2; xxxvi. 10; etc. It has been objected to me that in Gen. xviii. 1, Abraham must have been sitting *within* his tent on account of the heat. But this is on the supposition that the door of the tent faced the south; for if it faced the north or the west, he might easily sit outside, especially as it was only *toward* (אֶל) the heat of the day; *i. e.*, the forenoon.

Where was the שֹׁרֵץ *forum* or market-place in a city of Israel? All, I believe, are agreed that it was at the gate, but the general opinion would seem to be that it was inside. My idea is that it was outside. In 2 Sam. xxi. 12, it is said that the men of Jabesh-gilead went by night and took the bodies of Saul and his sons from the wall of Beth-shan, where they were hung; and in 2 Sam. xxi. 12, it is said that they "had stolen them from the *street* (שֹׁרֵץ) of Beth-shan." Now as the gates of a town were closed every night, how could they have got in to steal the bodies? a thing they might easily have done if they were hanging on the outside. It appears to me that this is also the best way to understand שֹׁרֵץ in such

places as Gen. xix. 2; Judges xix. 15—20; see also 2 Kings vii. 17—20. It was perhaps the *Meidám* of the present day.

I shall trouble the reader with only one remark more. It seems to me, from a consideration of Rev. iv. 7, 8, that the cherubim of Ezekiel and the seraphim of Isaiah are identical. But there is a further proof of this which I have not met with in any part of my reading. It is this: there are only *two* seraphim in Isaiah's vision, as there were only *two* cherubim in the temple which is the scene of it. This I infer from the use of the phrase *this to that* (כִּי לְכָל), for *this—that* (כִּי מִן) never occurs except in places in which two *only* are spoken of; such are Ex. xiv. 20; xvii. 12; xxxii. 15; 1 Kings iii. 23; Job xxi. 23, 25; Eccles. iii. 19; xi. 6; Ezek. xlvii. 7. Should 1 Kings xxii. 20 be referred to, I reply that there were only two speakers there, as every Israelite would have inferred from the employment of this phrase.

Chiswick.

THOMAS KEIGHTLEY.

ON THE DATE OF THE NATIVITY.

IN the October Number of the *J. S. L.* there appeared an article "On the Periods of our Lord's Life and Ministry." The writer of this article, H. M. G., maintains that our Lord was born December 25, B.C. 4, that he was baptized at the end of the year A.D. 26, or January 1, A.D. 27, and that he was crucified at the passover of the year A.D. 29. It is with reluctance that I enter the lists against so learned a champion as H. M. G.; but having^a expressed a decided opinion on two of the points which he handles—the dates of the birth and of the baptism of our Lord—I share in common with other authors, the failing of not liking my hobby to be outridden. Had the arguments of H. M. G. seemed satisfactory, I should have held my peace: but, since they appear to me to lack the requisite basis of established facts, I am induced to take up the pen to controvert the opinions which he has maintained with so much learning.

The gist of his argument lies in the paragraph (p. 66). "The expression of Josephus certainly intends that Herod died in the thirty-seventh year of his reign; for thirty-seven would be the date upon all his coins and documents of that current year. As he died in March, and had been elected in June, it is plain that there were nine months accomplished of the current year; and he reigned in temporal duration thirty-six years and nine months. This would carry the termination of his life into the thirty-eighth consulate from that of his election (including the epochal one); and that thirty-eighth number is the consulate of Lentulus and Messala, the next in succession to that of Salinus and Rufus; under whose consulate, without question, Christ was born: for it was '*the year of the taxing.*'"

Now, in this paragraph there are several assertions, in which I am by no means disposed to acquiesce. In the first place, I cannot agree with

^a *J. S. L.*, January, 1855.

H. M. G., that "Josephus certainly intends that Herod died in the thirty-seventh year of his reign." The question is, whether Josephus meant years current or years complete. H. M. G. thinks the former, "for thirty-seven would be the date upon all his coins and documents of that current year." Perhaps H. M. G. will excuse me if I say, that I do not think that this follows any more than it would follow that Josephus meant to imply that Tiberius reigned no more than twenty-two years, whereas he elsewhere^b tells us, whatever H. M. G. may think to the contrary, that Tiberius reigned twenty-two years five months and six days. If H. M. G. will refer to *J. S. L.*, January, 1855, he will find some arguments to shew that Josephus, in giving the length of Herod's reign, did not mean years current, but years *complete*—about thirty-seven years and a half, according to our computation, viz., from September, B.C. 40, to February or March, B.C. 2. These same arguments apply to the thirty-four years which Herod reigned after the death of Antigonus. H. M. G. (p. 69) says, that "that year" (the year of Herod's death) "is called by Josephus, 'the thirty-fourth year of Herod's reign, after he had procured Antigonus to be slain.'" Begging H. M. G.'s pardon, I venture to remind him that he has quoted Josephus incorrectly. The words of Josephus are (I quote from Whiston's translation), "having reigned thirty-four years since he caused Antigonus to be slain and obtained his kingdom."^c H. M. G. here begs the question. The question is, whether these thirty-four years are years current or years complete. Did Josephus mean thirty-three years and a half, or thirty-four years and a half? H. M. G. *assumes* the former.

In *J. S. L.*, January, 1855, I have tried to shew that Josephus not only may, but *must*, have meant the latter. Our main reason for holding this is, because in that case Herod's death would fall about six weeks or two months after an eclipse of the moon, which occurred January 19, B.C. 2.

H. M. G. thinks that, because an eclipse is said to have taken place on the night of the 12th or 13th of March, B.C. 3, "this involves, by an almost necessary consequence, the happening of a sister eclipse, either six months before or afterward"!! We should, in this case, have eclipses every six months. But what need of guessing at such an eclipse, when, according to high authority, an eclipse actually took place which fulfils all the conditions of time required by the statements of Josephus? The eclipse, January 19th, B.C. 2, would leave space enough for the visit of Herod to Callirhoe, for his death and funeral, and for the tumult, which was suppressed before the passover. Unless I have some better proof I shall continue to believe that Herod died at the end of February or the beginning of March, B.C. 2, having reigned thirty-four years and a half after the death of Antigonus, and thirty-seven years and a half after he had been appointed king by the senate.

This brings me to a second assertion of H. M. G.—an assertion which I cannot admit without some further proof than what he has offered. He says, "that Herod reigned thirty-six years and nine months, having been elected in June." Trusting to Mr. Greswell, I had formerly stated

^b *Ant.*, xviii. vi., § 10.

^c *Wars.* 1, xxxiii. 8.

that Herod was elected in the autumn. As neither H. M. G. nor Mr. Greswell have given their authorities, I cannot investigate the matter as I could wish; but there is thus much to be said for September, that it leaves a greater space of time for the many events which must have taken place before Herod could be elected. There was, first, the expedition of the Parthians to Jerusalem, and the intestine commotions in that city, which lasted until Pentecost,^d then the seizure of Phasælus, then Herod's flight to Masada, and thence into Egypt. Then there was his voyage to Pamphilia—not a very speedy one, apparently; then his fitting out a fresh ship, his voyage to Brundisium, and his journey to Rome. All this could scarcely have been accomplished so early in the year as June, however early Pentecost may have fallen. Again on his return, before he could relieve Masada, the garrison of that fortress had already been reduced to such straits from want of water, that it was only by a timely rain that they were saved from the necessity of capitulation. This rain seems to indicate that the autumnal rains had already set in before Herod's arrival in Judæa on his return from Rome. Therefore, unless I see any satisfactory reason to the contrary, I shall continue to prefer September to June as the probable date of Herod's election.

This, however, is a minor matter. I will pass on to the concluding sentence of the paragraph in question. At the conclusion of that sentence I find the following words, "Sabinus and Rufus, under whose consulate, without question, Christ was born: for it was '*the year of the taxing.*'" These words, at first sight, staggered me. "Under whose consulate Christ was born," and that, too, "without question." I had always been accustomed to consider that there was considerable question about it. When Scaliger and many other learned men have held such widely different opinions about the date of the birth of Christ, I must say that I was startled to find that it was asserted that, without question, our Lord was born in that particular year: and why?—"because it was '*the year of the taxing.*'" This puzzled me still more; for of all knotty chronological points there are few more difficult than this of the taxing. On further reading, however, I found H. M. G.'s authority. In page 68 he tells us that the year in which our Lord's "birth happened, must have been quite undisputed among the early Churches," and that Sulpicius Severus states that it took place under the consulship of Sabinus and Rufus. Now a greater and earlier authority than Sulpicius Severus, lets us into the secret, that the early Churches knew nothing at all about the matter. Augustine^e writes, "Ignorantia consulatus quo natus est Dominus, et quo passus est," etc. If Augustine and his cotemporaries knew not the date, is it likely that so late an author as Sulpicius Severus can be relied on? H. M. G. himself acknowledges that the rest of the testimony of Severus is not trustworthy. What confidence, then, can we place in this particular part of it?

H. M. G. wishes greatly to shorten the reign of Tiberius. His main arguments are, first, "the alleged improper insertion of certain consulates;" secondly, "the succession of the Syrian deputies;" and, thirdly,

^d Jos., *Ant.*, xiv. xiii., 4.

^e *De Doctrina-Christ.*, ii. 42.

“the best direct authorities,” of which the only one produced is Clemens Alexandrinus.

Into the question of the consulates I shall not follow H. M. G., but shall be content to abide by the generally received opinion of learned men. As to the question of the Syrian deputies, he quotes Josephus, who says, “that the only two appointed by Tiberius were Valerius Gratus, who remained in Judæa eleven years, and Pontius Pilate, who tarried there ten years.” Hence, he argues, p. 72, that “the reign of Tiberius could not have exceeded twenty-two years: it probably did not fully attain that period.” Now, it is true, that eleven and ten added together make twenty-one only, and that, even if we add twelve months for the voyages to and fro of the two procurators, we shall make twenty-two years only; but then, it must be recollected, that Josephus does not expressly say that Annus Rufus was superseded at the very commencement of the reign of Tiberius. He might (for aught that Josephus says) have remained in office a twelvemonth, or even more, after the death of Augustus, before Tiberius thought fit to send Valerius Gratus to succeed him. The words of Josephus are but a slender thread on which to hang so heavy an argument. Nor is this thread much strengthened by the words of Clemens Alexandrinus. Clement does indeed say, that Tiberius reigned twenty-two years, but he does not deny that that emperor reigned any more than twenty-two years. Josephus too, in one place,^f says that Tiberius reigned twenty-two years; but then, a little afterwards, § 10, he tells us that these twenty-two years were, in fact, twenty-two years five months and three days.^g Clement may have meant the same; but even if he had limited the reign of Tiberius to twenty-two years, his authority is not to be pitted against the earlier authority of Josephus, of Tacitus, who says,^h “Annis, mox rei Romanæ tribus ferme et viginti obtinent,” and of Suetonius,ⁱ who writes, “Paulo post obiit, octavo et septuagesimo ætatis anno, tertio et vicesimo imperii.” Tertullian also, an earlier writer than Clement, writes respecting Tiberius, “Imperium habuit annis xxii. mensibus viii. diebus xiii.”

The length of the reign of Tiberius is not, however, of such immediate importance to the determination of the dates of the birth and baptism of our Saviour, as is the date of the commencement of that reign. From what year are we to begin to count those years, in the fifteenth of which John began to baptize? H. M. G., p. 69, writes, “We take of course, as irrefragable, the authority of St. Luke, that this ministry took its commencement in the fifteenth year of Tiberius, and that that computation dates from the adoptive title of that emperor, three years before the death of Augustus.” The latter part of this assumption I do not consider to be by any means irrefragable. What other author dates the years of the reign of Tiberius from “three years before the death of Augustus?” Suetonius

^f *Ant.*, xviii. vi., 5.

^g We had been accustomed to regard the accession and death of each early emperor as among the best determined of all chronological eras. If these are unsettled we shall begin to think that chronology is in a state of chaos, and that there is not a single firm spot on which we can anchor our belief.

^h *Ann.* vi. c. 51,

ⁱ *Tib.* 73.

^j *Adv. Jud.* viii.

does not calculate the years of Tiberius from that date, neither does Tacitus. Dion Cassius (lviii. 24) has a remarkable passage which proves that Tiberius himself dated the years of his reign from the year in which Augustus died. H. M. G. himself, p. 72, alludes to this passage. He says, "Dio assigns the consulate of Tiberius's twentieth year to Aulus Vitellius and Fabius Persicus" (who were consuls A.D. 34). The way in which H. M. G. gets out of this difficulty is by asserting that Dio must have been mistaken, since, in the conclusion of the chapter, he asserts that these consuls were put to death the same year, whereas Aulus Vitellius lived to be emperor thirty years afterwards. If H. M. G. will take the trouble of referring to Dio^k or to Tacitus, he will find that the prænomen of the consul B.C. 34, was *Lucius*, not Aulus. It is H. M. G. who is mistaken, not Dio. Unless H. M. G. produces any reason more satisfactory than this, I shall still adhere to the belief that the twentieth year of Tiberius was from August A.D. 33, to August A.D. 34, and that the fifteenth of Tiberius Cæsar^l was from August A.D. 28, to August A.D. 29.

I shall still believe that our Saviour was just about thirty years of age (not twenty-nine^m) at the time of his baptism, and that he was born on or about January 1,ⁿ B.C. 2.

It would be beside my purpose to follow H. M. G. through his observations on the order and date of the other events of our Lord's ministry: but, p. 81, I find two observations which I cannot pass over without notice. He says, "It appears to us that St. Matthew's account plainly marks the time of the wise men's arrival at Jerusalem by the time of the birth of the child." He means to imply that the arrival of the wise men at Jerusalem was nearly, if not quite, coincident with the time of the birth of the babe at Bethlehem. With this conclusion I do not wish to quarrel. It may, or may not, be correct. But I must protest against the professed quotation by which he seeks to support it. Professing to quote Matthew ii. 1, he writes, "Jesus being born at Bethlehem, behold, wise men from the East came to Jerusalem." Now, if H. M. G. means to imply that

^k The passage of Dio is as follows:—*εἰκοστῇ ἔττει τῆς ἀρχῆς ἐπισάντος, αὐτὸς μὲν, καίτοι περί τε τοῦ Ἀλβανὸν καὶ περί τὸ Τούσκουλον διατρίβων, ἐκ ἐσῆλθεν ἐς τὴν πόλιν, οἱ δ' ὕπατοι Λούκιος τε Οὐιτέλλιος καὶ Φάβιος Περσικὸς τὴν δεκαετηρίδα τὴν δευτέραν ἐώρτασαν (οὕτω γὰρ αὐτὴν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰκοσετηρίδα ὠνόμαζον) ὥς καὶ τὴν ἡγεμονίαν αὐθις αὐτῷ κατὰ τὸν Ἀυγουστον δίδοντες.*

^l Luke iii. 1.

^m Among other reasons for believing that Jesus was not less than thirty years of age at the time of his baptism is the regulation implied in the words, Numbers iv. 3, "From thirty years old and upwards, until fifty years old, all that enter into the host to do the work in the tabernacle of the congregation." It appears from these words that none of the Kohathites, among whom was the priestly family of Aaron, might officiate before he was thirty years of age. Our great High-priest, who came to fulfil the law, would, it may be supposed, scrupulously abstain from transgressing that law, by assuming the priesthood at an earlier age.

ⁿ This precise day is named solely for the purpose of avoiding the fraction of a year. December 25, B.C. 3, would suit my calculations equally well.

this is a quotation from the Authorized Version, he is incorrect. The words of our version are, "Now when Jesus was born," etc. If H. M. G. intends his professed quotations as an improved translation of the original, I cannot agree with him. To my mind the indefinite time of the aorist γεννηθέντος, is better preserved in the Authorized Version than in his unauthorized translation.

The second observation which I wish to notice is, that Herod was probably at the baths of Callirhoe at the time of the visit of the magi. He may have been there already; but I should rather infer that he was still at Jerusalem. Else St. Matthew would scarcely have written, ver. 3, "He was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him." My own idea on this subject may be found by referring to *J. S. L.*, January, 1855, p. 391, note ".

Having so lately stated my own views on this and on several other points connected with the birth of Jesus, I need not recapitulate them here. I need only add that, if H. M. G. holds to his opinion as firmly as I hold to my own, this "flourishing plant" is not likely to be at present "ejected from the *Hortus Theologicus*."

Burton Pedwardine.

H. H. B.

THE SMOKING FLAX.

SIR,—How very much it is the case with us, that, when the ear becomes accustomed, from early years of life, to the words of well-known passages of Holy Writ, the mind, in the meanwhile, has not investigatively realized, nay, has not at all rightly understood, the meaning those words were designed to carry!

My attention has been drawn, of late, to a notable instance of this superficialness of apprehension in regard of those oft repeated and highly valued words which we have in the forty-second chapter of Isaiah, the 3rd and 4th verses; cited also afterwards by St. Matthew, xii. 20, 21. I would court the opinion of some of your able correspondents, and, far from less wishfully, your own, on a point or two of notice connected with that important text.

1. What idea has been attached, in the minds of innumerable readers, to the simile "smoking flax?"

(1.) In the first place, strange it appears to me that this idea, "*smoking*," though not, in the remotest manner, contained in the Hebrew word, is, nevertheless, produced to us, not in the English Bible only, but in the LXX., and Latin Vulgate Versions: "λίνον καπνιζόμενον." "*linum fumigans*."

(2.) The reading in the English margin, "*dimly burning*," is strictly and entirely correct. It is so after the following manner, viz.—

(3.) The Hebrew word נַפְתָּלִי acquires all its specific meanings, by its generic signification being *a feebleness or diminution of power*. Thus, therefore, as applied

[1.] To *sight*, it signifies "*dimly seeing*." It is thus made use of concerning Isaac, Gen. xxvii. 1; Moses, Deut. xxxiv. 7; Eli, 1 Sam. iii. 2; Job, Job xvii. 7. When Jacob was about to die, another word, כָּבֵד, *heavy*, is made use of in his case; it was not the dimness of age, but the oppression of sickness and of death.

[2.] Used concerning *strength*, it signifies "*being faint*," Eze. xxi. 7. "Every spirit shall faint."

[3.] Descriptive of *sores* it signifies "*being abated*," Nahum iii. 19; Levit. xiii. 21, 39.

[4.] Its signification with *sins*, is that of "*restraining*." In this case its use is transitive, 1 Sam. iii. 13. Eli "*restrained* not his sons."

[5.] So, then, in like manner, when applied to *fire*, it signifies "*dimly burning*."

2. For what purpose, however, should flax be burning?

(1.) I take it that the vulgar notion, needlessly held, in reference to the term "*smoking*," has been that some less or greater quantity of flax is supposed, in the simile, to be in an ignited state, ready to burst into flame, but not yet flaming; not yet red with heat. I submit, however, that this view of the matter would put us entirely wrong with the practical bearing of the passage. How so? That flax could not, in any probability, be burning, in its raw material, for any useful purpose. Such ignition, then, must be either spontaneous through damp, (whereby some of our ships have been destroyed,) or otherwise accidentally or mischievously. In any such case, it follows that the act of a benefactor would be to quench it, instead of not to quench it.

(2.) The only useful purpose for which flax could be burning, would be that of either lamp or candle. This appears to me, unquestionably, to be the simile used in the passage. I observe that Taylor's *Hebrew Concordance* does not dream of any other interpretation,—does not hesitate a moment to give this as the only sense of it;—"Applied to the wick of a lamp or candle that burns dimly."

(3.) In that acceptation, how utterly inapplicable, while, as I said above, without warrant, is the participle "*smoking*."

3. Was it the fact, however, that flax was used, (and, to become proverbial, it would require,) used commonly, for the ignitable substance of a lamp or candle? This must be established as fact. On this point, then, I find the following notable particulars:—

(1.) Before the making of candles from wax or tallow was invented, which is very ancient, ("qui perantiquus est;" Pitiscus in verb. Lucerna;) all person used lamps fed with oil.

(2.) These were first invented by the Egyptians: Euseb., *De Præpar. Evang.*, x., 6; Clem. Alexand., *Strom.*, i.

(3.) It is a most important corroboration of profane history to sacred, which we have in the second book of Herodotus, where he speaks of that festival of the Egyptians, called by them the "festival of lighted lamps." Sect. 62. He states that when they have assembled themselves for sacrifice in the city Sais on a certain night, "ἐν τινι νυκτι," "they all burn lamps, many lamps, round about their houses; the lamps being vessels full of salt and oil; and the wick, τὸ ἐλλύχνιον, upon the surface, and

this burns the whole night; and the name appertaining to the festival is *Λυχνοκαίη*, *Lychnoeæa*, the burning of a lamp. Those of the Egyptians who do not come to this assembly, observing what night it is, also all of them burn lamps; thus not only in Sais is this burning, but throughout all the land of Egypt." Then the historian adds these memorable words: (and who does not see that they do most fairly corroborate the Mosaic account of the plague of darkness.) "*Ὅτεν δὲ ἔνεκα φῶς ἔλαχε καὶ τιμὴν ἡ νύξ αὕτη, ἜΣΤΙ ἸΠΟΣ ΠΕΡΙ ἈΥΤΟΥ ΛΟΓΟΣ ΛΕΓΟΜΕΝΟΣ:*" "But on what account that night has had for its lot that light and honour, concerning this, there is a SACRED NARRATION TOLD."

(4.) It has just been shewn, from Herodotus, that the *ἐλλύχνιον* in the case of the lamp, was placed on the surface of the oil. What, then, was this? Of what material was it? At the moment, I will, as an old-fashioned classic, cite from Scapula: "*Funiculus papyraceus, sive sparteus, cannabinusve aut stupeus, qui fistulæ in lychno erectæ immisus uritur.*" It is true that Pliny applies the term to the inflammable matter rather than to a wick; to sulphur, croton oil, etc. I will not prolong this question by entering into that matter. Scheller, in his most erudite *Worterbuch*, disposes of the word quite simply by the answer, "*Docht.*"

(5.) Then, as regards the wick for candle, the evidence is more decisive. "*Candela erat funiculus pice delibutus, vel cera circumdatus. Posteaque etiam ex papyro fecerunt, quam cera circumdabant*" (Pitiscus). See the various authorities, Servius, Donatus, etc., there cited, to establish that statement. I omit them for more brevity, and hasten to the last point I shall at present handle.

4. Admitted that this appropriation of flax, viz., to burn in lamp or candle, and these burning dimly, is the prophet's simile, for what purpose, then, shall we consider the lamp, if such it were, to be supposed in that simile to be burning?

(1.) Shall we connect this exegetically with the parable of the virgins? Shall we apply it, that is, to the custom of the marriage—the going with lamps to meet the bridegroom? Then this dimly burning lamp will not be one of those which the five foolish carry, but one of the five carried by the wise. Here would be cheering encouragement to those who are, indeed, following the Redeemer, yet with a feeble testimony: though their light be but dimly burning, he will not extinguish it; he will, on the contrary, bring it to a brighter flame.

(2.) Shall we, however, rather apply this, because of the context, to the lamp of investigation into truth; for one's own realization of it for the one part; and confession of it, likewise to others, before the world? "*Dominus illuminatio mea.*" "*Sic luceat lux vestra,*" etc.

Then the rich treasure of encouragement which the passage contains and conveys is beyond all price to the sincerely seeking soul; for,

[1.] According to the genius of the Hebrew language, the assertion, "he will not quench," is to be converted from a negative to an affirmative, "he will make it burn brighter."

[2.] The whole of the context expresses that satisfying enlightening in the truth which gradually, and, at last, completely, removes all dimness

of doubt and mistrustfulness, which St. Matthew, following the LXX. has clearly seen; and has explained by the words, "Until he send forth judgment unto victory; and in him shall the nations trust;" that victory being allowed by all commentators to mean the triumph of the truth.

[3.] The main point, however, for which I have written these strictures and seek opinions, on the passage, still remains, finally, to be stated under this head of the subject; viz., it is a most important and invaluable circumstance that the words in the following verse, which are rendered so darkly in our translation, "He shall not fail nor be discouraged," are the very same words in the original as those which had just been applied to the lamp and to the reed. Thus, then, the passage would read as follows: "The shaken reed he will not break; the dimly burning lamp he will not extinguish, until he make judgment go forth to truth. He shall not burn dimly, and he shall not be shaken, until he place judgment in the earth; and the isles (the Gentile nations) shall place their hope in his law." The LXX. most correctly dissolve the negative into the affirmative by ἀναλάμψει, and rightly translate the other term as καὶ οὐ θραυσθήσεται.

I have greatly hurried my conclusion, but will at once conclude; recommending especially to the examination and opinion of your readers this last particular,—the erroneous omission of the English version to observe and to render the repetition of the words πᾶς and γὰρ, and the correctness of the rendering of the LXX. borne out by the New Testament, in observing that repetition and giving it its full force.

J. C. K.

CLEMENS ROMANUS.

SIR,—I read in Dr. Burton's *Lectures on Eccles. History*, Lec. xi., p. 258, "The epistle of Clement is undoubtedly a genuine work; and, though it is greatly to be wished that more copies should be discovered, our own country is to be congratulated that it possesses the only copy now known to be in existence." Then, in a note, it is added: "It was sent by Cyril, patriarch of Alexandria, afterwards of Constantinople, to Charles the First, and is now in the British Museum."

In reference to that statement, I should feel obliged by information, either from your own pen, or that of any of your correspondents, in answer to the following queries.

I. One of the two Italian translations is entituled, "Lettere di S. Clemente Papa, tradotto del Greco e dal Siriaco da D. Gio. Battista Gallicciolli. In Venezia, 1798." Is, then, the M.S. which was sent to Charles the First written in Greek and in Syriac; and was it from this that the Italian translator translated?

2. The twenty-fifth section or chapter of the Epistle,—that concerning the Phoenix,—if written by Clement, is fatal of course to its character, as I will not say written by inspiration of God, but even as a production exhibiting wisdom and truth. Is, then, the twenty-fifth section, the section assaying to prove the credibility of the resurrection of the dead by

the resuscitation of the Phoenix, contained in the above-mentioned MS. in the British Museum? If yea, are there any suggestions which can be obtained from the state of the MS.; from its appearance; from its penmanship; or from any apparent inequality of age or of material, between one part of it and other parts; by which that most objectionable, because fabulous, elucidation of the writer's subject can be fairly got rid of from the epistle?

3. I have just received and perused the "Patrum Apostolicorum Opera," by Dressel, Leipzig, 1857. In his Prolegomena on the Epistle of Clement, he proposes to get rid of the affair of the Phoenix on the ground of *incoherency*. He suggests that the twenty-eighth section is the proper continuation of the subject which ends the twenty-first. On the ground of want of cohesion, therefore, he would reject the intermediate sections. What degree of assent may be given with safety to this mode of expurgation?

4. It appears that the twenty-fifth section is cited by St. Cyril of Jerusalem; Catech. 18, 8. Not having his writings in my possession, I shall be thankful to be informed in what way the citation of the revivification of the Phoenix is made; whether as a fact which he, Cyril, also affirms, or as a polite using by St. Clement of a commonly received belief.

Certainly, if that one section could be got rid of from the epistle, either by lawful criticism of the text as existing; or by just investigation of the manuscript, whether one or more; or by the discovery happily of others; then would this epistle of St. Clement be indeed a most invaluable document.

D. IL. MEA.



NOTICES OF BOOKS.

The Acts of the Apostles Explained. By JOSEPH ADDISON ALEXANDER, D.D. London : James Nisbet and Co. 1857. Two vols. 12mo.

WE can scarcely imagine a greater treat for any reader possessed of a taste for exact criticism than to have this work by Professor Alexander put into his hands. Those who are acquainted with the author's previous work on Isaiah will open this one with large expectations, and we can confidently promise that they will not be disappointed. If thoroughness in the investigation of the original, and delicacy in apprehending the finest shades of meaning—if clearness of statement, and comprehensiveness of scholarship without any of that confusion which too frequently accompanies it—if these properties, combined with a truth-loving yet reverential spirit, can impart value to a critical work on the Sacred Scriptures, then is this work of Dr. Alexander certain to take a very high place in the theological literature of this country. Among the many very creditable productions which have of late years issued from the hands of British critics, there is not one with which it will not bear a highly favorable comparison. The author's own countrymen, Stuart and Hodge, have done good service on the fields of sacred criticism and exegesis; and it is with feelings of gratitude and pride that we mention the names of Brown and Alford and Eadie among ourselves: but with all respect for these diligent and well furnished labourers in the exhaustless mine of God's Word, we must still take leave to state it as our opinion, that Dr. Alexander has come nearer the *ideal* of critical excellence in the work which he has just published, than any one of his predecessors. He has given a very strict and searching exposition of the original, and has plainly taken advantage of all the aids of modern scholarship in his labours. Yet his work is happily free from those innumerable references to German commentators which bristle upon the pages of almost every English critic, and which suggest only too readily the sources from which the greater part of what is valuable has been derived. Dr. Alexander's work is *independent* in the only sense which that word can bear in reference to such a subject; for while he acknowledges, appropriates and employs the labours of former investigators, he has at the same time advanced upon them all, and given to his work a decided character and impress of its own. Plain without being superficial, learned without being ostentatious, minute without becoming tedious, and eloquent without those "panni" of ornament which are so much out of place in critical publications, his work is fitted, we think, to attract a wide circle of readers both in England and America, and might even, we believe, be worthily regarded by our masters in Germany as a first payment of the heavy debt, under which they have laid us by their learned and laborious interpretations of Scripture.

The course which our readers would follow on having such a work put into their hands, would probably be the same as that which we ourselves adopted—to refer first to some well-known passages of great exegetical difficulty or high doctrinal importance, and having employed these as a kind of *experimentum crucis*, then to turn to the exposition generally, and consider the skill and success with which upon the whole it has been executed. We shall follow this course now in seeking to set before them the merits of Dr. Alexander's work, and trust in the brief space which alone we can allow ourselves, to satisfy them of the justness of those laudatory observations which have already been made.

We begin by a reference to chap. xiii. 48, last clause, thus translated in the English version, "And as many as were *ordained* to eternal life believed." We need not remind our readers how much controversy has been expended on the word *τεταγμένοι*, here translated "ordained." It involves in its explanation the grand point in dispute between Calvinists and Arminians, and has in consequence been subjected to a vast amount of criticism. The battle of predestination has been keenly fought around this word, it has been viewed as an impregnable citadel by the one class, and has been earnestly pressed at least to declare itself neutral by the other. The following are the remarks of Dr. A. upon it. "*As many as were ordained, ordered or appointed, to eternal life*"—a favourite expression of John and Paul to signify salvation. It occurs in this book only here, but is several times employed by Luke in his Gospel (x. 25; xviii. 18—30). The violent attempts which have been made to eliminate the doctrine of election or predestination from this verse, by rendering the last verb *disposed, arrayed, etc.*, or by violent constructions, such as that adopted by Socinus, '*as many as believed were ordained to everlasting life,*' can never change the simple fact, that wherever this verb occurs elsewhere, it invariably expresses the exertion of power or authority, divine or human, and being in the passive voice cannot denote mere disposition, much less self-determination, any more than the form used in ii. 40, above, which some have cited as a parallel example." Compare with this Alford's note on the passage, "The meaning of this word (*τεταγ*) must be determined by the context. The Jews had *judged themselves unworthy of eternal life*; the Gentiles, '*as many as were disposed to eternal life,*' believed. *By whom* so disposed is not *here* declared. *We know that it is God who worketh in us the will to believe,* and that the preparation of the heart is of him; but to find in *this text* pre-ordination to life asserted, is to force both the word and context to a meaning which they do not contain." Here then our critics join issue, Alexander being decidedly of opinion that the word here used implies pre-ordination, while Alford as strenuously contends for its neutrality. With his usual felicity of reference the latter refers to chap. xx. 13, where we find the apparently analogous expression, *διατεταγμένος ἦν*, denoting not any *foreign* interference, but the resolution of Paul himself, who is there spoken of; yet even with this striking corroborative

reference to support it, we do not think that Alford's neutral view of the passage before us can be maintained, or that any other than Alexander's is tenable. By the context, says Alford, the meaning must be determined; to the context then let us refer. "The Gentiles," we are told, "rejoiced and glorified the Word of the Lord;" this they did in a body, and without distinction, but then something more is added, which discriminates vitally between two classes of the "rejoicing," for we moreover read, "and as many as were τεταγμένοι to eternal life believed." Now had it been meant to express no more by the word in dispute than some self-originated distinction among those who rejoiced and glorified the name of the Lord, how meaningless must this addition appear! Did not they *all* seem "disposed" for eternal life so far as man could judge of their feelings, and is it not plain that among a multitude all *rejoicing* because eternal life was preached to them, it would have been almost absurd to say that those only believed who were *inclined* to accept this gift? Why should they have *rejoiced*, if they were not for *the time*, and *as far as depended upon themselves*, disposed and desirous to lay hold of the offers of salvation? But the historian tells us that in many cases this rejoicing was only transient: that numbers of the multitude were of the πρόσκαιροι, of whom our Lord speaks (Mark iv. 17), "who receive the word *with joy*, yet endure but for a time;" and that only those "believed" who were (τεταγ.) "appointed" by God himself to the possession of eternal life. It thus appears evident that by the use of this term, the inspired writer intends to lift us to a higher region than the human; to teach us that above the level of the χαίροντες and the δοξάζοντες, there were the τεταγμένοι εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον—the chosen recipients of the blessings of salvation.

We next turn to chap. xxvi. 28, thus rendered in the English Version,—"*Almost* thou persuadest me to be a Christian." There is no expression in the whole book more obscure and uncertain in its precise meaning than the phrase ἐν ὀλίγῳ, rendered "*almost*" by our translators. It cannot be doubted that the common translation is by far the most natural one, but it has been generally held by modern critics that the words will not bear the meaning thus assigned them. Alford says that the rendering "*almost*" is inadmissible for want of any example of ἐν ὀλίγῳ having this meaning, and he refers to several passages in classical Greek writers to prove that ὀλίγου, or ὀλίγου δεῖ, or παρ' ὀλίγον, is *their* mode of expressing such a meaning. True; but is it necessary to suppose that Agrippa spoke only in the purest Greek? Have we not reason to believe the very opposite? and is it not in the highest degree probable that such a provincialism or colloquialism as ἐν ὀλίγῳ in the sense of *almost*, might easily have taken the place of the more classical expression? As Alford himself states in his section on the sources of the history, this whole discourse has been reported very nearly as spoken, so that neither the apostle nor the evangelist is to be held responsible for the bad Greek which the king may have employed. Alford's own proposed rendering appears to us to deprive the passage of all sense, and thus to save the royal

Greek at the expense of the royal understanding. We cannot quote his whole note, but shall probably bring forward enough to convince our readers how far he is here from the mark, when we set before them the previous solemn appeal of Paul, and then add the translation of the passage under dispute which Alford proposes: "King Agrippa, believest thou the prophets? I know that thou believest. Then Agrippa said unto Paul, *Lightly* (with small trouble) art thou persuading me to be a Christian." Nothing to our mind could be more discrepant to the whole circumstances than such a rendering of the words. Instead of "using lightness" or shunning trouble in this speech, it is one of the most solemn, elaborate, and skilfully constructed of all those which have been recorded as delivered by the great apostle. Agrippa may have been a hardened, but he was also a sensible, man, and no such weak and puerile expression of contempt for the reasoning of Paul was, we think, likely to escape him. On the other hand nothing was more natural than that under the deep emotion which we regard the impressive appeal of Paul as having excited within him, he should have uttered such an exclamation as that attributed to him in our common version; and perhaps the very emotion under which he laboured was itself the cause of his neglect of mere verbal accuracy or elegance.^a

But let us now look at Dr. Alexander's exposition of the passage. "This remarkable expression of Agrippa," he says, "has been variously represented as a trivial jest, a bitter sarcasm, a grave irony, a burst of anger, and an expression of sincere conviction. By far the simplest and most satisfactory interpretation, although not even mentioned by some modern writers, is the one found in the oldest English versions; *in a little, i. e., in a small degree* (Tyndale and Cranmer *somewhat*). The idea, then, is, 'thou persuadest me a little (or in some degree) to become a Christian;' *i. e., I begin to feel the force of your persuasive arguments, and if I hear you longer, do not know what the effect may be.*" This view is in good keeping with the circumstances of the narrative, and is worthy of much consideration. On the grounds mentioned above, as well as from the tenor of the apostle's reply (who desired surely that his hearers should be not a *little* way, or even a *great* way, but the *whole* way brought over to the belief of the Gospel—*ὁποῖος ἐγὼ*), we prefer the common translation; but among all the other renderings which have been proposed, there is not one which will bear a moment's comparison with that adopted by Professor Alexander.

Let us next consider our author's remarks on that most interesting but difficult passage, chap. xxiii. 3—5. "Then said Paul unto him (the high priest) God shall smite thee, thou whited wall, for sittest thou to judge me after the law, and commandest me to be smitten con-

^a Will Mr. Alford forgive us if we remark that in his own note on this passage he has himself committed a common enough *conversational* mistake, and may therefore be all the more ready to accept our explanation of the king's want of accuracy on this occasion?—"To my mind," he says, "the first of these considerations *decide* that Agrippa," etc.

trary to the law? And they that stood by said, Revilest thou God's high priest? Then said Paul, I wist not, brethren, that he was the high priest: for it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people."

"The fashionable sentimental view of this verse (5) is that Paul acknowledges his having spoken in a fit of passion, and apologizes for it. But besides the sheer impossibility of making 'I wist not,' mean 'I did not consider' (or remember at the moment) the acknowledgment itself would be at variance with all the facts and circumstances of the case. The objection is not, as some seem to imagine, that the great apostle was entirely free from human weakness, but that its exhibition is precluded by the special commission, under which he acted as a witness for his master at Jerusalem, both to the masses and the rulers of the Jews. In what imaginable juncture of his history, if not in this, could he expect Christ's promise to be verified (Matt. x. 19, 20)? There is something monstrous in the supposition that a single act of violent injustice, added to the thousands which he had before experienced, betrayed him into an intemperate expression of unsanctified resentment, and that Luke has solemnly recorded this unhappy and unseasonable burst of feeling for the sake of shewing how inferior Paul was to his master, and yet how gracefully and frankly he could make amends for such offences. Jerome's famous contrast between Paul's behaviour and that of Christ upon a similar occasion (John. xviii. 22, 23) though often quoted with applause, contains a double fallacy: first, in assuming that our Saviour literally acted on his own rule (Matt. v. 39), whereas he expostulated and resisted no less really, though certainly in milder terms, than Paul himself; and then in taking it for granted that the conduct of his followers was to be governed by his own example, in a situation to which theirs was never perfectly analogous, rather than by his immediate and express instructions with respect to the particular emergency in which they were to act. But the question still remains, in what sense Paul could say, 'I wist not that he was the high priest,' or as the words ought to be translated, 'I knew not that he is the high priest.' After mentioning several unsatisfactory opinions that have been held on this point, Dr. A. adds, 'The use of the present tense (*ἔστι*) necessarily implies, that Paul's ignorance, whatever it might be, still continued. The combination of the past and present forms can only be explained by understanding him to mean, 'I did not know (and I do not know now) that he is the high priest.' This is referred by some to his irregular appointment, or to his having been deposed, or by a sort of irony to his personal unworthiness. But the most satisfactory solution is that Paul means to deny that Ananias was in any such sense high priest, as to make him a violator of the law in Exodus. . . His reply to the reproach of the bystanders may be paraphrased as follows, 'You upbraid me with insulting the high priest of God, but whom or which of those who bear the name? The very presence of so many claiming the distinction shews how utterly your practice has departed from the ancient one, and makes it scarcely possible to know who is or who is not the legitimate successor of Aaron. When I reprov'd this man and threatened him with condign judgments for his malice against me and against him whose I am and whom I serve, I did not know, and do not now know that he is the high priest of God. I know, though you do not, that the office exists only in appearance and in name, and that even that will soon be done away, so as to leave not a vestige of that ancient and divinely-constituted priesthood, which I could not have reviled without a flagrant violation of the law, 'Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.'"

Though some parts of the note of Dr. A. thus abridged may be objected to, we think it contains the key to the true explanation of the difficulty which has so much perplexed commentators on this passage. We are not in circumstances to say exactly how much meaning there was in these words of the apostle (I did not know, etc.), as that must greatly have depended on the *tone* in which they were uttered. That

he meant in them tacitly to throw contempt on such appointments as were then made to the office of high priest by the Roman governors, and thus to hint that the whole Jewish system had become effete, we think extremely probable. It is well known that at this period the high priests of the Jews were mere puppets of the Roman power,—elevated to the office, and dispossessed of it at pleasure; and therefore Paul may very well be regarded as here saying to those who claimed for Ananias that respect which was of old required by God himself to be given to “the ruler of the people,” “Is *he* now the object of your reverence? I did not know that such was the case: there is so much irregularity and uncertainty now about such appointments, that I could not know who was held worthy of respect, although I well know the ancient precept, “Thou shalt not speak evil of the ruler of thy people.”

We shall next refer to another equally difficult passage, the well-known one (chap. vii. 14—16) in the speech of Stephen, in which so many errors seem to be combined. It is thus translated in the common English Version: “Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen souls. So Jacob went down into Egypt, and died, he, and our fathers, and were carried over into Sychem, and laid in the sepulchre that Abraham bought for a sum of money of the sons of Emmor the father of Sychem.” There are no fewer than *three* manifest contradictions in this passage, as it stands above, to the history as given in the Old Testament Scriptures. There is, first, the number of the Israelites in Egypt when Joseph assembled his father and his whole family, stated at seventy-five instead of seventy persons, as in Gen. xlv. 27; Exod. i. 5; and Deut. x. 22, of the Hebrew Text. There is, next, the statement that Jacob as well as his sons was buried at Shechem, whereas according to the Old Testament (Gen. l. 13) the former patriarch was buried at Mamre in the cave of Machpelah, and the others, so far as appears, were buried in Egypt. There is, thirdly, an evident confusion between the buying of the field of Machpelah by Abraham from Ephron, the Hittite, and that of a field near Shechem by Jacob of the sons of Hamor. These obvious mistakes have always been a favourite theme with infidels (they seem to have had great influence in determining the *phases* of Mr. Newman), and they have strongly exercised the ingenuity of all orthodox commentators. We see nothing for it but to admit the errors, and to make the enemies of the Bible welcome to any use they can make of such an admission. It is very evident we think that the argument will not even here be all in their favour. Luke was surely as well acquainted with the statements of the Old Testament as any of us, and if, notwithstanding, he here recorded the slight inaccuracies of Stephen, just as they were made, the inference seems inevitable that *truth* alone guided his pen, and that he is therefore worthy of credit when much more important matters are reported to us on his authority. Dr. Alexander, we are sorry to find, contends for the absolute and literal accuracy of Stephen on principles which would justify any rationalistic or Socinian tampering with the text of Scripture. He

admits that for reading *Jacob* instead of *Abraham*, or for omitting *Abraham* and construing the verb with *Jacob* in ver. 15, there is not the least manuscript authority, and yet he is willing to adopt these or any similarly forced explanations, rather than admit the plain fact that Stephen, who *was not an inspired historian*, erred, and that Luke, who *was an inspired historian*, truthfully reported what he said. His whole note on this passage we deem a singularly unhappy one, and as embodying principles of criticism which might be employed to enervate and destroy any statement of the Bible; while we cordially agree with the important remark of Alford that "the fact of the mistake occurring where it does, will be far more instructive to the Christian student than the most ingenious solution of the difficulty could be, if it teaches him fearlessly and honestly to recognize the phenomena presented by the text of Scripture, instead of wresting them to suit a preconceived theory."

We must now notice the difficult and important passage, iii. 19—21, thus rendered in the English Version: "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted, that your sins may be blotted out, when the times of refreshing shall come from the presence of the Lord, and he shall send Jesus Christ, who before was preached unto you, whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restitution of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all his holy prophets since the world began." The great obscurity and perplexity of this passage must be apparent to every English reader; and it is admitted by every scholar that it does not faithfully represent the original. "*Ὅπως ἂν*" translated "when," always elsewhere, when followed by the subjunctive, as here, has the meaning of "so that," "in order that" (Matt. vi. 5; Acts xv. 17). "The translation, therefore," as Dr. Alexander observes, "which has been copied from the Vulgate into all the English Versions, must be set aside upon a double ground; because it violates the usage of the language to obtain a sense which is itself not a good one. We are bound to reject every explanation which supposes *ὅπως ἂν* to be a particle of time, until some clear example of that sense can be discovered. Coming back then to the only sense justified by usage, we must understand 'the times of refreshing' to be in some way suspended upon their repentance as a grievous condition;" and in like manner the only grammatical construction of the next verse is, "so that (or in order that) he may send Jesus Christ," this sending being presented as a reason for repenting now. But to what sending do the words refer? Not to our Lord's first advent or appearance as a Saviour which had already taken place, but either to his visible return hereafter, or to his presence in the hearts of individuals. The last agrees best with the context as a motive to immediate personal repentance; but the first, with all analogy and usage, as the Father is not elsewhere said to send the Son, as he is said to send the Spirit into the hearts of men, as a matter of inward invisible experience, but into the world, as a literal external fact of history. Alford denies, though we think on insufficient grounds, that the *ἂν* of the following verse can

be regarded as qualifying the *πάντων*, and leaves us in some doubt as to what he understands by "the glorious restoration of all things." Alexander is more explicit, and says that the ἀπ' αἰῶνος (which he well renders from the beginning of the prophetic period or dispensation) is

"clearly the opposite extreme to the final restitution mentioned just before, which does not therefore mean the restoration of all moral agents to a state of perfect holiness and happiness, but simply the completion or the winding up of that stupendous plan which God is carrying into execution with a view to his own glory, and the salvation of his elect people. This consummation may be called a *restitution*, in allusion to a circle which returns into itself, or more probably because it really involves the healing of all curable disorder, and the restoration to communion with the deity of all that he has chosen to be so restored. Till this great cycle has achieved its revolution, and this great remedial process has accomplished its design, the glorified body of the risen and ascended Christ not only may, but must, as an appointed means of that accomplishment, be resident in heaven, and not on earth."

Let us now lay before our readers a connected and corrected translation of the whole passage, "Repent ye, therefore, and be converted for the blotting out of your sins, in order that the times of refreshment may come from the presence of the Lord, and that he may send Jesus Christ, who was before appointed to you (as your Messiah), whom the heaven must receive until the times of the restoration of all things, of which God had spoken by the mouth of his holy prophets from of old (throughout the whole prophetic dispensation)." The *sequence* thus indicated is as follows:—The Jews are to repent and be converted, and so obtain the forgiveness of their sins; the times of refreshment are then to follow, and last of all God is again to send his Son, who had already been revealed as the appointed Messiah, and who must now abide in heaven until these previously mentioned events should have occurred. According then to the *order* which God has fixed, the Jews, as a nation, are first to be converted and forgiven, then times of refreshing by the copious outpouring of the Spirit are to be enjoyed; the consequence is to be that the world at large will be converted, "the fulness of the Gentiles shall be brought in;" and then, on this restoration of all things spoken of by the prophets having been accomplished, the Son of God is again to appear and receive his people to himself for ever. Such is the view which we take of this very difficult passage; but we desiderate, both in Alexander and Alford, a clear and comprehensive statement of the results of their criticism on its several parts, and feel ourselves unable so to *piece* together their remarks as to have a definite conception of the meaning which they respectively attach to the *whole* passage.

We have thus glanced at some of the greatest difficulties which the exegesis of this book presents, and shall now give some specimens of our author's skill and delicacy of criticism in dealing with more ordinary passages. The following are his remarks on chap. ii. 2, 3:—

"The effusion of the Spirit was preceded and accompanied by sensible signs addressed to the ears and eyes of those assembled. The first impression was that of an extraordinary noise, preparing them for the still more extraordinary sight that

was to follow. The sound came *suddenly*, and could not therefore be referred to any natural external cause. It came *from heaven*, which may refer both to the sensible impression of a sound descending from above, and to its real supernatural origin as caused by God himself. The natural sound which it resembled most was that of a strong wind; but it was something more as appears from the comparative expression *as*, which would be otherwise superfluous. The word translated 'rushing' is a passive participle, meaning *borne* or *carried*, and is properly descriptive of involuntary motion caused by a superior power, an idea not suggested by the active participles *rushing*, *driving*, or the like, which seem to make the wind itself the operative agent. The other epithet in Greek means more than *mighty*, being expressive not only of a quality, but of an effect, *violent*, destructive. The noun itself which these words qualify, is not the ordinary term for wind, but a stronger one answering to *blast* or *gust*. The whole phrase therefore is descriptive of a powerful tempestuous commotion of the air by some extraordinary cause. *Cloven* should rather be *distributed*, so that one appeared on each. The common version which implies that each tongue was divided into two or more, as represented in most paintings of the scene before us, is at variance with the usage of the Greek verb (*διαμεριζόμεναι*), which sometimes denotes moral separation or estrangement, but never physical division. 'Like as of fire,' or more exactly 'as if of fire;' this comparative expression, like the one in the preceding verse leaves room for doubt as to the presence of material fire, or of a real wind. A similar dubiety exists in Luke's account of the bloody sweat and of the visible descent of the Holy Ghost upon our Saviour at his baptism. The very frequency however of this form of speech in Luke's writings makes it proper not to press it, as a proof that the appearance was unreal."

On the vexed question of the *mode* of baptism, the following are the author's remarks on verse 38 of the same chapter, "Repent and be baptized :"—

"Even granting that the Greek verb originally meant to immerse, to dip, or plunge—a fact which is still earnestly disputed—it does not follow that this is essential to its meaning as a peculiar Christian term. On the contrary, analogy would lead us to suppose that like other Greek terms thus adopted, it had undergone some modification of its etymological and primary import. As *presbyter* no longer suggests personal age, nor *deacon* menial service, nor *supper* a nocturnal meal, as necessary parts of their secondary Christian meaning, why should this one word be an exception to the general rule, and signify a mere mode of action as no less essential than the act itself? Even if it could be shewn that immersion was the universal ancient practice, both of Jews and Christians, it would prove no more than the universal practice of reclining at meals and mixing wine with water. Least of all can it be shewn that Peter, in requiring this vast crowd to be baptized upon the spot, intended to insist upon their complete submersion under water as the essence of the rite prescribed. Besides the arbitrary character of such a supposition in itself, it is forbidden by the obvious analogy between water baptism and the baptism of the Holy Ghost, which from the time of Moses to that of Christ, had always been conceived of not as an immersion, but as an affusion, or effusion, an abundant pouring from above."

Dr. Alexander gives a very satisfactory account of Stephen's apparently sudden and passionate invective, chap. vii. 57. Here he says :—

"One of Stephen's lines of argument was completed. He had shewn by a simple but masterly historical deduction, the temporary nature of the ceremonial law, and of the temple as a part of it, concluding by a reference to Solomon himself, and to Isaiah who had foretold the same changes now foretold by Stephen. What could have been added to this chain of proof? All that was left was to take up and complete the other line of argument, designed to shew, by means of the same history he

had been expounding, that the Jews had always been unfaithful to their trust, and that the abrogation of the present system was not only necessary to the execution of God's purpose as revealed from the beginning, but a righteous retribution of the sins of those by whom the system was administered. Having prepared the way for this conclusion by referring to the sins of Joseph's brethren, and of the Israelites in Egypt and the wilderness, he now suggests the conclusion itself, not by a formal inference, but by a terrible invective, summing up all that he had said on this point in a brief description of the men whom he addressed, and of the nation which they represented. There is no need, therefore, of supposing any interruption in the thread of his discourse, much less a passionate excitement caused by an appearance of hostility, or inattention in his hearers. This whole idea of a sudden interruption and a violent apostrophe is founded on the notion that this long discourse of Stephen is a rambling talk which never comes to any point, and, therefore, must have been unfinished; or, at most, a desultory, incoherent compend of the national history, which could not be complete unless brought down to date; whereas the speech is a historical argument, in which the facts are rather pre-supposed than formally related, and as soon as it has reached the conclusion aimed at, it is instantly arrested. The compound terms 'uncircumcised in heart and ears,' mean those who hear, and think, and feel, like Gentiles; and their sudden application to the Sanhedrim, instead of necessarily implying a departure from the theme of his discourse, is rather a tremendous summing of it up in the conclusion, that these proud representatives and rulers of the chosen people were in fact mere heathens. Some conception of the force of this concluding blow may be obtained by supposing one impeached among ourselves (Americans) to describe the senate at whose bar he stands as slaves and negroes. Even this, however, is without the sting belonging to the charge, not only of political and social infamy, but of religious apostacy and reprobation. Far from being an ungovernable burst of passion, this was the other great conclusion at which Stephen had been aiming from the first, and which was now established by irrefragable proofs, not only with respect to the contemporary race, but also to preceding generations, whose accumulated guilt might justly be rewarded with the loss and abrogation of those very institutions which had been the object of their trust and worship."

"Εἰς διαταγὰς ἀγγέλων, 'at the orders (or command) of angels,' not as its authors or legislators, which is sometimes made an argument against this explanation, but as messengers or heralds, through whom the divine communications passed, as a military word of command does from rank to rank, or from officer to officer, until it reaches the whole corps or army. It was this angelic ministration in the giving of the law that Stephen here employs to aggravate the guilt of those who had not kept it. At the same time, this allusion to a preternatural and superhuman incident in sacred history, as well as to a spectacle or scene of unexampled grandeur, and connected with the great transaction from which Israel derived his national existence and pre-eminence, imparts to the conclusion of this speech, which some regard as broken and unfinished, a rhetorical sublimity, which, added to its logical and moral force, entitles it to take rank with the noblest specimens of ancient eloquence."

Chap. xiv. 23, *Χειροτονήσαντες*. "The meaning of this word has been the subject of protracted and vehement dispute between Presbyterian and Episcopal interpreters. The latter grant that the original etymological import of the word is to vote by stretching out the hand, but they contend that usage had so modified its meaning as to generate the secondary sense of choosing or appointing without any reference to votes or popular election;^b and this they insist upon as the unquestion-

^b Alford with his usual fairness is here an exception to the above remarks. He gives with approval the rendering of Erasmus "*cum suffragiis creassent*;" and adds that though the word had come to mean any kind of appointment (x. 41), yet by the analogy of vi. 2, it must here mean that "the apostles ordained the presbyters whom the Churches elected." See his note on chap. xx. 17, for another striking example of his critical impartiality.—*Reviewer*.

able use of the word here, where the act is predicated, not of the people, but of Paul and Barnabas, who cannot be supposed to have voted for these elders with the outstretched hands. The middle ground is that the verb itself, expressing as it clearly does the act of Paul and Barnabas, can only mean that they appointed or ordained these elders, without determining the mode of election or the form of ordination; but that the use of this particular expression, which originally signified the vote of an assembly, does suffice to justify us in supposing that the method of selection was the same as that recorded (not in i. 26, where the election was by lot, and by direct divine authority but) in vi. 5, 6, where it is explicitly recorded that the people chose the seven, and the twelve ordained them. Another question as to this verse is the question whether 'elders' means diocesan bishops, presbyters (*i. e.*, teaching elders), ruling elders, deacons, or church officers in general, including perhaps all these special offices, except the first, which was of later date. In favour of this comprehensive meaning is the fact that deacons are not mentioned, and the corresponding usage of the word in the organization of the old theocracy or Jewish church, from which the term was silently transferred to that of Christ, and not from the human and most probably much later institution of the synagogue, considered as a separate society. 'In every Church,' or rather as a distributive phrase 'Church by Church,' which does not necessarily imply that there were several ordained in each, though this is the most natural construction of the language, and the one most agreeable to Jewish usage, as well as to the fact of a plurality of bishops no less than of deacons in the Church at Philippi (Phil. i. 1)."

Chap. xix. 2, "We have not so much heard whether there be any Holy Ghost." Our author's explanation of this seemingly strange statement, is, like Alford's, based on the use of the aorist ἤκούσαμεν, as referring to a definite point of time, viz., their conversion.

"Heard," he says, "is in Greek an aorist, relating not to a long interval, but to a single point of time, to wit, the date of their conversion or profession. They did not then hear the Holy Spirit mentioned, any more than if there had been no such being. Far from receiving his extraordinary gifts, they were not even baptized in his name, or instructed in relation to his work and office. The expression of this fact is strong but natural, and not without analogies even in the dialect of common life. As, if an Englishman were asked whether he swore allegiance to the queen on a particular occasion, he might simply say that no such oath was tendered to him; but if he wished to make his negative peculiarly emphatic, might express the same idea by declaring that he did not hear her named; or still more strongly, that he did not hear that there was such a person, without any risk of being understood to mean that he had never heard of her."

Neither of our critics refer to the old and obvious explanation of this verse, which takes ἐστὶ in the sense of *given*, as in John vii. 39 (οὐπω γὰρ ἦν Πνεῦμα ἅγιον). We still think, however, that this is the best solution of the difficulty. These disciples had been taught by John to *look for* the gift of the Holy Ghost, for the Baptist continually taught his followers that Christ would "baptize them with the Holy Ghost," but they had not yet heard of the remarkable effusion of the Spirit which had taken place—they had not learned that, as promised, he had been abundantly bestowed, now that "Jesus had been glorified."

In the famous passage (xx. 28) Dr. Alexander prefers the reading Θεοῦ το Κυρίου, as we are glad to find Alford also does in his third edition. Dr. Alexander well remarks "In favour of this reading, it may be alleged that the apparent incongruity of the expression would naturally tempt men to amend it (and thus give birth to the reading

Κυρίου), while the very same cause would prevent its introduction if it were not genuine." Alford's note on the passage is to the same purport and conclusion, we think, as to the superior authority of the reading of the *text. recep.*, which is also the reading of the *Codex Vaticanus*.

We shall only farther notice the striking word *δαιμονιστέραν*, as occurring in the consummately wise and powerful speech of the apostle at Athens. There is amazing skill displayed in making this word the *point d'appui* of the whole subsequent address. It was the very term calculated by the meed of praise which it contained to conciliate his hearers, and at the same time by its ambiguity to pave the way for that condemnation which he meant afterwards to express. It is quite impossible to transfer the beautifully amalgamated idea into our language, and the consequence has been that a one-sided and greatly exaggerated view of the apostle's meaning has alone been given by our translators. But Alford seems to us to err as much on the other side when he says that "*blame* is neither expressed nor implied;" blame we think there undoubtedly is, though most delicately suggested; and we conceive that Dr. Alexander has got hold of the real import of the word when he says, "this equivocal expression seems to be deliberately chosen here, as justly descriptive of the Athenians, and yet not liable to shock their vanity or prepossessions in the very outset of this great discourse." The whole of the apostle's speech was wrapped up, as it were, in this simple word; it implied that the Athenians were a *peculiarly religious* people in their way, and this is the first development of its meaning which is given, for, says he, "as I passed by, I considered with interest the objects of your worship," but he soon glides into its blameable signification, and proceeds to shew that their religion, after all, was no better than *superstition*; for, says he, "I found among you an altar with this inscription, To an unknown God—whom therefore ye *ignorantly* worship, him declare I unto you."

One thing we much regret in connexion with the work under consideration, and that is, that Dr. Alexander has not gathered up the results of his criticism, as Stuart and others have done, in a completely new translation of the whole book. He tells us in his preface that "it was one of his main objects to perfect the translation, so as to place the English reader as nearly as possible on the same footing with the student of the Greek text." This object he has certainly effected, for there is hardly a verse on which he has not suggested some obvious improvement. But his end would have been much more fully gained if he had summed up, in a new translation of the whole book, the results of his criticism on its several verses. This would have hardly cost him any additional labour, and would have formed a valuable contribution towards that really *improved* English version of the Scriptures which we hope by and by to see published; and of which every new critical work that issues from the press (and none more so than this one of Dr. Alexander's), is so clearly proving the necessity.

The New Testament of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, in the original Greek: with Notes, by CHR. WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Part I. The Four Gospels. Part II. The Acts of the Apostles. London: Rivingtons. 1857.

IN our former notice of this work we remarked that, with all our reverence for the Fathers, and our real dependence on them as witnesses to the teaching of the early Church, we could not place implicit confidence in them individually as expositors of the Scriptures in detail. Some of them, we know, were much addicted to that phase of mysticism which spiritualized everything, often to the detriment of the divine truth of the text before them. And those who wrote under the influence of the Arian controversy, were inclined to speculations on the inscrutable subjects involved in it, which were really not of the nature of faith. The Gospel of St. John would be more likely than any other to give occasion for exhibiting both these tendencies; and we are convinced that Dr. Wordsworth's notes would have been more valuable, if he had been somewhat more discriminating in his selection of patristic matter, and had treated that gospel more in the way in which he has treated the Acts of the Apostles. He has certainly investigated this latter book in a much more independent manner, and the result is, that he has much more entered into the spirit of it. In fact, for some reason or other, the Fathers were, as St. Chrysostom remarks, not much acquainted with this book; and they have made comparatively little use of it. On this account, perhaps, Dr. Wordsworth has been less diverted from his own course of investigation by patristic authority.

However this may be, we regard his notes and dissertations on the Acts of the Apostles as considerably superior to those contained in the first volume. We shall give our readers an account of his Introduction. After stating various opinions as to the plan, or want of plan of the book, which are not satisfactory, as being chiefly based on low views of the qualifications of the sacred writer, Dr. Wordsworth, by way of refutation, applies his own theory to the facts of the case. It appears from the Acts, that St. Luke in his former treatise, had professed to give an account of what Jesus *began* both to *do* and to *teach* when he was *in person on earth*.

"In this book, the sequel of his gospel, he, being inspired by the Holy Ghost, comes forward and reveals to the world, what the same Jesus, having ascended into heaven, and being exalted to the right hand of God, and there sitting in glory, continues 'to do and to teach,' not within the narrow confines of Palestine, or during the few years of an earthly ministry, but 'in Judæa and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the earth,' by the instrumentality of apostles and apostolic men, and apostolic churches, in all ages of the world; and what he will ever continue to do and to teach, *from heaven*, even till he comes again in glory to judge both the quick and the dead."

This appears to be the sacred writer's own view of his plan, and it accords with what is stated by other sacred writers, and with the internal evidence of the book itself.

Christ promised to be always with his apostles, and said before his

ascension: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you." St. Mark's concluding words may be regarded as the argument of the Acts: "He was received into heaven, and sat on the right hand of God; and they went forth and preached everywhere, *the Lord working with them, and confirming their words*, with signs following." So St. Paul represents Christ in glory, as the origin of all that is done or taught in the church: "He that descended is the same also that ascended, . . . and he gave apostles, etc., for edifying the body of Christ." This is the representation of the Acts. The choice of Matthias is referred to Christ. It was he who "shed forth" the Holy Ghost. It was the Lord who added to the church such as should be saved, whether in Judæa, or in the various countries to which the apostles went, till the standard of the church was planted at Rome.

We thus see in the Acts, the continuance and extension of Christ's working, and we see a greater manifestation of his glory in the manner of his operation. Christ had promised that his disciples should do greater works than he had done, because he was going to the Father.

Dr. Wordsworth, we remark, has spoiled this really-excellent argument, by referring the fulfilment of this promise to external miracles, in which sense it was not true, that their works were greater than his. But in the sense of a more effective exercise of the "power of God unto salvation," it was abundantly so; the greater power of their miracles, which they always ascribe to Christ, was not in the outward wonders wrought by them, but in their more glorious spiritual results.

Certain words occur in the Acts, which remind the reader of this concentration of power in Christ. The word *Κύριος* is applied to him, in the sense of Jehovah. The word heaven continually occurring, presents to the reader the inner sense of the book. Christ goes up into heaven, towards which the apostles gaze, from which a messenger comes to announce that Jesus is received into heaven, and will come again from heaven.

This view, then, first, accounts for the title of the book, the "*Acts of the Apostles*." The apostles are said *πράττειν*, while Christ alone is said *ποιεῖν*. Two of the apostles, however, are chiefly mentioned, as specimens, and a selection from their transactions is given as characteristic of the whole. Dr. Wordsworth might, we think, have added, that nearly up to the period in which this book was written, the acts of each apostle, in establishing the frame-work of the church, were substantially the transactions of the whole apostolic college, as Professor Blunt has shewn in his *Church of First Three Centuries*.

On this principle, viz., that St. Luke is exhibiting the deeds of Christ, we may well account for the omission of many things in the personal history of the chief apostles, which it would have been very interesting to know. The omission of such matters of mere human interest, is itself an evidence that St. Luke was under inspiration. A common writer would certainly not have failed to tell us where and how St. Peter and St. Paul died. But they were apostles of Christ,

in whom the work of Christ, and not their personal history, was the matter to be described, as being the real subject of interest.

The object of this book, then, is to raise our thoughts to Christ as enthroned in heaven, and ruling all things for the establishment of his kingdom, till God shall have put all things under his feet; and hence we may be assured, that no weapon formed against his church shall prosper.

Dr. Wordsworth then proceeds to test the soundness of the proposition, that this was the design of the writer, by evidences derived from the state of the world when the book was written, as compared with the evidence of the book itself. His statements on this head are full of interest, and partly coincide with the masterly sketch which Professor Blunt has given on the same subject. The following is Dr. Wordsworth's summary of the discussion :—

“ On the whole, then, we see that the Acts of the Apostles displays evidence of a well organized system of preparations, extending like a complex net-work over a great part of the world, and continued through many centuries, for the manifestation of the glory of Christ in the progress of his gospel. This history shews that when he had ascended into heaven, and was seated in glory at God's right hand, he used these previous adjustments, as means and appliances for the advancement of his kingdom. It shews also that he, enthroned in heavenly glory, overruled the workings of Satan against his Church, whether in external assault or internal discord, and made them subservient to his glory and her welfare. It traces her progress under his favour and protection, from the upper room at Jerusalem, till ‘ the little one became a thousand and a small one a strong nation.’ ”

Dr. Wordsworth goes on to shew how the *teaching* also of the apostles is that of Christ. That teaching became universal in place and time from the day of Pentecost, when his bestowment of the Spirit began. We owe our knowledge of the gospel itself to Christ's teaching from heaven. Christ on earth wrote nothing. Till the Holy Ghost was given, the apostles were not qualified to write on the subject, their own views being up to that time still dark. We should have had no gospel but for this heavenly teaching. And in like manner, from the same teaching solely, we derive our knowledge on the subject of church government and polity.

The following statement is not unnatural from the *Canon* of Westminster :—

“ We need not hesitate to say that in the Acts of the Apostles the ‘ shepherd and bishop of our souls,’ Jesus Christ, is revealed to us sitting in his chair in his heavenly cathedral, surrounded by his angelic hierarchy, and delivering to all christian bishops and pastors a divine charge, a holy pastoral, a symbol of christian doctrine, a code of ecclesiastical polity, a rule of Church discipline, a chart of missionary enterprize, a system of biblical evidences and exegesis, for the perpetual instruction and regimen of every age and clime, even till he comes again to judge the quick and dead.”

We need not say how widely different all this is from the all-but universal assumption of *development* abroad; a theory which cannot be maintained without almost impious violence to the language, nor without dark reflection on the character of the New Testament writers, and

which is as little supported by facts as the Lamarkian hypothesis of creation.

With some doubts as to the expediency of Dr. Wordsworth's language occasionally, we are much impressed with the value of this introduction, we are convinced that its reasoning is in general sound, and we acknowledge that it has thrown increased interest to our own mind over the Acts of the Apostles. The following paracletic remarks are well worthy of attention. In considering whether a path for unity may not be found in this book, Dr. Wordsworth says :—

“ On the one hand they who revere the doctrinal symbols and primitive organization of the Church . . . may be invited to consider whether . . . some among us may not have placed the Church in too prominent an attitude and in too independent a position, and whether it be not our duty to raise our eyes and to direct the eyes of others upward, from the Church upon earth to Jesus Christ her Lord, acting and teaching in and by her from heaven. The Holy Ghost has taught us in this divine book not to rivet our minds even on the Apostles themselves ; but to concentrate all our thoughts and affections on him who sent them, and acts by them. Let us not regard the Church as separable from Christ ; but ever think on her as dependent on him, and as deriving all her grace and virtue, all her authority and power from him alone. Let us not forget the words of the psalmist, speaking to her, the queen at Christ's right hand, and saying, ‘ He is thy Lord God and worship thou him.’

“ On the other hand, if we are tempted to think lightly of the apostolic and primitive Church, if we are disposed to treat with indifference any of the specific functions of the christian ministry, and its three-fold orders, then let us pause and consider, whether we have rightly conceived the question at issue ; and whether by such a temper of mind we may not be doing grievous wrong, not to men, but to Christ ; . . . vouchsafing to send his Holy Spirit from heaven to teach his apostles and to guide them into all truth ; and whether we may not be guilty of disobeying him and of sinning against the Holy Ghost.

“ To think less of men, and to think more of God ; to lift up our eyes from the Church militant on earth, to her Lord and Head triumphant in heaven is what the Holy Ghost teaches us in the Acts of the Apostles.”

Analytical Exposition of the Epistle of Paul to the Romans. By JOHN BROWN, D.D., Senior Minister of the United Presbyterian Congregation, Broughton Place, Edinburgh, and Professor of Exegetical Theology to the United Presbyterian Church. Edinburgh : Oliphant and Co. London : Hamilton and Co. 1857. 8vo. pp. xvi. 639.

DR. JOHN BROWN, descended, we believe, from the celebrated commentator of that name, has for many years been one of the most popular ministers in Edinburgh. He mentions, in his dedication to Principal Lee, that they were fellow-students at that university sixty years ago, so that both must have advanced nearly a *decennium* beyond the age of man. In his lectures from the pulpit, and as professor of theology, the Epistle to the Romans has much occupied his attention, and his “illustrations corrected and enlarged by an increasing acquaintance with the inexhaustible subject, have, in substance, been repeatedly, though in different forms, presented to Christian congregations and to classes of theological students.” Under the impression that he might be able to

shed some new light on the general design of this epistle, and on some of the more important and obscure passages of it, he had designed to prepare a grammatical, historical, and logical exposition. Though he feels himself obliged to give up this more extended plan, the venerable professor says :—

“ Yet I am unwilling to go hence without leaving some traces of the labour I have bestowed on this master-work of the apostle, without contributing some assistance, however limited, towards the production of what, whenever produced, will mark an era in the history of scriptural exegesis—a complete exposition of the Epistle to the Romans

“ For the last twelve months my principal occupation has been, so to condense and remodel my work, as to present, in the fewest and plainest words, what appears to me the true meaning and force of the statements contained in this epistle of the doctrine and law of Christ, and of the arguments in support of the one, and the motive to comply with the other; and to do this in such a form as to convey, as far as possible to the mind of the general reader, unacquainted with any but the vernacular language, the evidence on which I rest my conviction, that such is the import of the apostle’s words.”

We believe that the professor has in the main founded his remarks on a true exegesis, and they contain a rich amount of valuable thought, expressed in felicitous language, and animated with a constant glow of devout feeling. There are one or two points, however, of some importance, in which, in company with most commentators of a particular school, Dr. Brown has, in our conviction, misinterpreted the apostle’s language. One of these relates to the words which the apostle uses in connexion with justification. We are far from having any dispute with Dr. Brown on the subject of that doctrine, or as to the fact that the statement and proof of the doctrine of justification by faith is an important part of this epistle; but when Dr. Brown makes justification in the *forensic sense* the sum and substance of the gospel, and almost the one idea of this epistle, he does so without exegetical warrant, and implies the existence of a real *Paulinism*.

The fundamental proposition of the epistle is contained in the words, “ The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, for therein is the righteousness of God revealed from heaven.”

“ These words,” says Dr. Brown, “ I am afraid are very imperfectly understood by most who read them. . . . ‘ The righteousness of God ’ is a phrase which in the New Testament is ordinarily employed in a somewhat peculiar way, being almost uniformly used in reference to the subject of the sinner’s justification before God. ‘ Righteousness ’ with the apostle Paul usually signifies justification—sometimes viewed as a *privilege* bestowed by God—sometimes as a benefit enjoyed by men. . . . The long description of the righteousness of God in the concluding paragraph of the third chapter of this epistle exactly suits the divine method of justification, and it suits nothing else; I therefore consider the righteousness of God here as meaning *God’s way of treating a sinner as if he were just* in consistency with His own righteousness.”

Accordingly Dr. Brown, according to the heading of 400 pages of his work, has made the entire doctrine of this epistle to consist of “ the divine method of justification ” as thus defined, viz., as a method of judicially clearing the guilty. Now, as we have said, there ought to be no doubt that the removal of “ condemnation ” through Jesus Christ

is a most important part of the divine method of securing the object of the gospel, and the object of all divine revelation; but it assuredly does not constitute that object. How does St. Paul state the problem to be solved? The moral condition of man, whether of Gentile or Jew, had been proved incurable by previous methods. Law, whether natural or revealed, had rather aggravated the evil than removed it; and the gospel claims to have accomplished the task which was found impossible to law. Men were still all more or less vicious and guilty. But it would have been an idle contradiction in terms to say, that law could not judicially declare the opposite of these universal facts. St. Paul would never have thought of saying that law could not clear the guilty in the sense of absolving them. It was plainly a subjective effect on the moral condition of man at which the law aimed, but for which it was inadequate, accomplished in the gospel through Jesus Christ. That effect was, expressed negatively, the "condemnation," the putting down of sin in the flesh; expressed positively, it was the righteousness of God, *δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ*, a divine righteousness; the restoration of man to a "divine" nature. In opposition to what Dr. Brown says of the "peculiar way" in which *δίκαιος* and *δικαιοσύνη* are used by the apostle, we maintain that he uses these terms in no other sense than they are used elsewhere in the Old and New Testaments. This is different, certainly, from their use in profane writers. In the Scriptures, "righteousness" is a general term, denoting the character of a *good man*. The Jews abused the term by applying it to conduct which had no ethical element, and this was *their* righteousness. "The righteousness of God revealed from heaven" was the ultimate object of divine revelation, and the ultimate carrying out of which was the triumph of the gospel. We are confident that a legitimate examination of all the cases in which these words are used, which our space will not allow us to exhibit, would shew that the apostle has not departed from the ordinary use of them in this epistle, and that while the doctrine of justification by faith is clearly laid down by him, it is so as the foundation only of the doctrine that the gospel is the effectual *cure*, in connexion with its other spiritual appliances of human nature—a cure which is essentially contained in the idea of salvation.

We allow that the verb to "justify" is, perhaps sometimes confined to the forensic sense of clearing the guilty, and that in the Epistle to the Romans this is at least an important element in its meaning. The removal of "condemnation," is the first step which conciliates the alienated heart; it is the breaking forth of that generous sunlight of divine love, which falls upon the head of one who had hitherto kept his cloak more tightly drawn, the more fiercely the tempest of law was assailing him. The man who had been living in malice and envy, morose, and hating his neighbour, is cured, *ὅτε ἡ χρησιότης καὶ ἡ φιλάνθρωπία ἐπεφάνη τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν Θεοῦ*. But the forensic sense of justification is not all that is implied even in the word *δικαιοῦν*. St. Chrysostom is doubtless right in saying, as cited by Grotius, "*multi plus esse justificari quam recipere remissionem peccatorum*." But

Bengel has stated his views on the subject to the same effect. On Rom. iii. 20, he says: "Sin and righteousness are directly and fully opposed to each other; but sin involves both guilt imputed (*reatum*) and vice: therefore righteousness expresses the opposite of both. . . . Hence δικαιοῦν is to make righteous or to justify; . . . he therefore who is justified is transferred from sin to righteousness, *i. e.*, from guiltiness imputed, *a reatio*, to judicial innocence, and from vice to moral health. There is the same frequent signification in the two words sin and righteousness, like that which commonly obtains in the word ἄφεσις, and in words which denote it, such as ἀγιάζω, ἀπολούω, καθαρίζω, κ.τ.λ. And thus some pregnant sense of the verb *to justify*, denoting the entire divine bestowment, by which we are restored from a state of sin to righteousness occurs, as in the passages Titus iii. 7, compared with 2 Cor. v. 21, Rom. viii. 4, compared with v. 16." We quite agree however with what Bengel goes on to say, viz., that elsewhere the word is restricted to a part of this meaning, especially to the delivery from sin in the judicial sense; and that St. Paul constantly so uses it when he speaks of God justifying the sinner through faith. The text in 2 Cor. v. 21, referred to by Bengel, is the noted one: "He made Him who knew no sin to be sin for us, that we might become, γενώμεθα, "the righteousness of God" in Him, where the righteousness is plainly subjective on the part of him who is in Christ; and, according to Bengel, the δικαιωθέντες in Tit. iii. 7, denotes the same subjective effect, denoting, as the connexion shews, the moral change to which we have referred above declared in the 4th verse.

We are bound to say that Dr. Brown states as fully and earnestly as possible the essential connexion of holiness with "the divine method of justification," but he makes this a corollary to the great problem of the gospel, rather than the grand result which it aims at and secures. Sanctification is with him "the evidence of the divine method of justification," instead of being, as we believe, the substance of the δικαιοσύνη Θεοῦ itself.

We will only add that we decidedly differ from Dr. Brown, in his opinion that St. Paul is describing the normal condition of a converted man in the seventh chapter—that chapter contains the strongest expressions of bondage which could be applied to one who had not yet tasted the emancipating charm of divine love. However the Christian "militant here on earth" may feel that his struggle is arduous, and even the more so as he approaches the goal, his feelings are surely of a different order from those of the man who is made wretched, ταλαίπωρος, by a law, *i. e.*, a habit of hateful servitude. St. Paul certainly never elsewhere describes his experience in terms which can convey this idea. Always humble, and describing himself as *having been* the chief of sinners, and as being now what he is by the grace of God, he is always pressing forward; instead of saying δουλεύω τῇ σαρκὶ νόμῳ ἁμαρτίας, he says μου τὸ σῶμα δουλαγωγῶ, I bring into subjection my body.

With the exception of one or two points in which Dr. Brown's

theory has, we think, warped his exegesis, this is a work of a high order of excellence, and we congratulate the venerable professor upon the strength in which his bow abides, and the still effective vigour of his arm.

A popular Paraphrase on St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans, with notes.
By the Rev. A. CRAWFORD BROMEHEAD, M.A. London: Bell and Daldy. 1857.

MR. BROMEHEAD describes his work as follows:—

“The author has designated this ‘A popular Paraphrase’ of St. Paul’s great Epistle. In carrying out this view, he is willing to hope his work may not be altogether unacceptable to the learned reader; but his highest ambition has been, under the blessing of God, to place the apostle’s argument in a form intelligible to the unlearned, and to those who have little leisure for extensive reading, and who form the majority of society.”

We have seldom seen a more effective paraphrase than this. The author has expressed in language as compact as could well be used, his view of the sense of the original; and he has thus furnished an easy method of explaining many points in which the text itself might be obscure to one who was not familiar with the language of it. In cases where more extended remarks might be necessary to explain allusions, historical circumstances, and the like, and to defend the author’s view of the text; the reader is referred to notes at the end of the volume, in which, where the case requires, the original is explained on grammatic grounds.

Mr. Bromehead has, in general, taken the popular view of several points in dispute connected with this epistle, in some of which we should not agree with him. But his statements are far from commonplace, his views are theologically sound, his spirit is excellent, and his work is well adapted to the object which he has in view.

A Development-History of the Doctrine of the Person of Christ, from the earliest Times to the most recent. By Dr. J. A. DORNER. Second, considerably augmented, Edition, in two Volumes. Second Volume. Last Part. Second Division. The Doctrine of the Person of Christ, from the time of the Reformation to the present. (Entwicklungsgeschichte.) Berlin: Schlawitz. London: Nutt.

DR. DORNER is, we believe, not far from being sound in the “Faith once delivered to the saints,” and his convictions on the subject of Divine Truth coincide in the main with those whose only ultimate foundation is the Word of God. But in accordance with the philosophy of his people, he appears to regard all truth as the natural growth of the human consciousness, and therefore all the speculations of the human mind even on subjects beyond the sphere of unaided reason, as genuine developments of the history of truth. Hence, all the phenomena which the history of opinion presents stand in important

relation to each other, and from a wide survey of them, may be shewn to exhibit progress. Dr. Dorner says—

“ I felt under the necessity, in exhibiting this great history, which so nearly concerns the Church of the Lord, and on which so many of the greatest men of the Church have employed a good portion of their best powers, not to leave behind the unhistoric appearance, from which it would seem that wave followed wave without object, and without advance; but rather to make manifest—that which the science which is established on the soil of the Reformation, and that alone, shews—that through the efforts of history, up to the present time, a great object has been won. In the statement of that history, the object has constantly been to make apparent the progress of the doctrine, whether mediately or immediately, and to obviate, according to the author's ability, the prejudice that such movements were without mutual connexion, and the mistake of supposing, that instead of leading onwards, they only returned in a circle from zero to zero, according to that inhilistic conception of history which regards the dissolution of the Christian doctrine as the object of history and of science. But my conviction is, that the most recent period which has succeeded to one of great commotion, but of most fruitful results, is one in which everything obviously tends to the Christologic centre.”

If, by the grace of God, our German brethren come round to the truth as it is in Jesus, we may allow them to glory a little in a philosophy which seems to them to have solved by its own methods, those high problems whose true solution we find in Divine Revelation; and our hope is, that they may at length discover the only solid basis on which religious philosophy can rest.

Dr. Dorner compares the present *stadium* of the Evangelical Church to the period which succeeded the controversies to which the various systems of gnosticism gave rise; in which such men as Irenæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Tertullian, Hippolytus, Origen, “converted the *gnosis* into a leaven, for the advancement of the ecclesiastical system of doctrine.” We quite agree with Dr. Dorner, that these great men were right in not contenting themselves with opposing the mere dogmas of the Church to the Gnostic speculations, but it may be shewn with regard to every one of them, that the leaven they borrowed from such speculations was unwholesome, and tended to corrupt rather than to give health to the Christianity of their time.

We cannot enter into the particulars of Dr. Dorner's statement even of the present position of things in Germany on this subject. It is evident that some of the greatest of those who philosophize upon it, are still far from what Dr. Dorner calls the *evangelical consciousness*, as to the person and work of Christ. He shews, however, that on all hands, the ethical perfection of the character of Jesus is more and more insisted on, and this we are convinced is one of the strongest arguments for his divine nature. He states, too, that the tendency is to come to a Trinitarian view of the divine essence. Yet this view is scarcely at all connected with the doctrine of justification by faith, which is “the fundamental fact of the evangelical consciousness.” “It is,” says he, “by many almost forgotten on what point the ancient Church left this doctrine resting.” Yet, as it is already seen to be increasingly general, that all essential determinations of the idea of God would fain be reckoned Trinitarian; so it is more and more gene-

rally acknowledged, that the divine in Christ is to be taken in its absolutely highest and personal form, and thus to be distinguished from the divine in the world and in the faithful.

We are glad to know that there is an increasing phalanx of earnest and well-furnished men in Germany, who feel that they have "not so learned Christ," and who are more and more concerning themselves to know and to teach what may be gathered from the divine oracles on this great subject.

The Prophet Isaiah translated and explained. By D. MORITZ DRESCHLER. Part the third, containing the Chapters xl. to lxvi. Continued and completed after the death of Dreschler, by FRANCIS DELITZSCH, of Erlangen, and AUGUSTUS HAHN, of Greifswald. (Der Prophet Jesaja, übersetzt.) Berlin: Schlawitz. London: Nutt. 1857.

THE portion of the work contained in this volume is almost entirely from the pen of his two surviving friends, the papers of Dreschler left in their hands relating to this part of Isaiah not being adapted for publication. Hahn has completed the Commentary, making use of a few of Dreschler's notes; and Delitzsch has added a statement of his own views in reference to those of his fellow-labourer. In some particulars, the distinguished continuators of Dreschler's work differ from him and from each other; but in one point they agree, viz., in their conviction of the genuineness and authenticity of this important portion of Isaiah. But Hahn has made it an important point in his exegesis, to shew that the whole was written before the captivity, in which he coincides with Hengstenberg, and most of those who believe it to be the work of Isaiah. Delitzsch, on the contrary, contends that this latter part was composed in the early part of the captivity, and examines, in succession, the statements of Hahn, which bear on that subject; but he maintains, that views of the modern criticism as to its genuineness, derive no support from that supposition. In fact, the rationalists have, consistently with their assumption that there is no such thing as prophecy in the sense of a foretelling, fixed upon the last part of the exile as that in which these chapters must have been written, or on periods subsequent to that. The wonderful correspondence of the portraiture which these writings contain with the phenomena of the gospel history would still puzzle them, but that the newest criticism has created these phenomena from the real history, and ruled that they are mere copies of the prophecy!

Strong as we are convinced the evidence is in support of the most ancient tradition, derived from the internal evidence of these writings that Isaiah was the author, we feel with Delitzsch and with Umbreit, whom he cites to this effect, that the value we attach to these prophecies does not essentially depend on our belief that Isaiah was their author. Whether the author be the great Isaiah, or the "Great Unknown," he is still no less the Evangelist of the Old Testament.

Delitzsch had just concluded his remarks on the subject of these prophecies in somewhat glowing language, when, it appears, he was taken aback by the wonderful discoveries of Bunsen. That very original author has found out, to a certainty, that the writer of a large part of Isaiah, and of the whole of the last twenty-six chapters, is no other than Baruch; that the "servant of the Lord," about whom so much is said, is no other than Jeremiah, an idea, by the way, which is among the many feeble things which Grotius says on the Old Testament; that Isaiah did not collect his own prophecies; this was done by Baruch, and these last twenty-six chapters, together with another piece of his, were appended by him to an edition of Isaiah's works, published in Egypt. This said Baruch, moreover, is the author of some important prophecies of Jeremiah, he is the author of the Lamentations, of many of the Psalms, and he wrote the Book of Job!

"And so," says Delitzsch, "the great Unknown is revealed, and he is far greater than any one had ever imagined! However satisfactory it may be to some, to find in Jeremiah the 'Servant of Jehovah,' spoken of in these chapters; . . . all those who have felt in their own experience, that the 'blood which speaketh better things than that of Abel,' is no mere prophet and martyr-blood, will not cease to ask with astonishment, What! the Servant whom Jehovah has ordained as Israel's Mediator, for the salvation of the heathen, as his salvation to the ends of the earth; who bore our sins, and having delivered us from distress and judgment, has absolved us as our Priest; was this lowly, yet exalted Servant of Jehovah, resplendent in glory as prophet, priest and king; was this Jeremiah?" This question must one day force itself on Bunsen's own mind, and if he entertains it, the answer will at once dissolve the forms both of Baruch and Jeremiah."

We welcome this work as an additional proof that the learning and the earnest energy of Germany is arraying itself on the conservative side, and as a valuable addition to our literature on the subject of Isaiah.

Gnomon of the New Testament. By JOHN ALBERT BENDEL. Now first translated into English. With original Notes, Explanatory and Illustrative. Revised and Edited by the Rev. A. R. FAUSSET, M.A., of Trinity College, Dublin. Vols. I. and III. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark.

It may safely be said that the *Gnomon* of Bengel is, on the whole, the most valuable exegetical work on the New Testament which has ever appeared. Before, and during his time, there were great and productive writers on Biblical subjects, but in the person of Bengel something like a new era began in exegetical theology. Up to his time men had concerned themselves chiefly about what they regarded as the weightier matters of the Scripture, and wrote continually with an eye to their theological theories. Bengel's method was more strictly inductive. "The Holy Scriptures," says he, "are the sole repertory of that complete system of truth which man, as a being appointed to obtain everlasting salvation, needs to be acquainted with. Every, even the minutest Scripture detail, has its importance in the system of

revealed truth, and natural reason has often the power of seeing and tracing that importance, but never the power of choosing or rejecting such matter at pleasure the Scriptures best illustrate and corroborate themselves, consequently those expositions are safest which keep most closely to the text."

At the age of 25, in the year 1713, Bengel's duties as professor in a theological college at Denkendorf, required that he should go through the Greek Testament, exegetically, every two years. But seven years before that time he had been collecting materials for the work of exegesis, and his views of the requirements of this work had led him to a diligent inquiry into the state of the text. Hence his critical researches were those which were first laid before the public. But during ten years his exegetical lectures, delivered to his pupils, were continually improved by fresh materials and by corrections; and in 1722 he resolved to embody these in an exegetical commentary on the New Testament. It is true that, in this interval, the interest of Bengel's active mind had been directed to some subjects of a sacred kind, in which his researches, or speculations, are of more doubtful value, such as his chronological and apocalyptical discussions; but his survey of the New Testament, as a whole, with a view to a more exact acquaintance with every portion of it, were, in fact, continued to the end of his life. And the relief he obtained from his professional duties by his elevation to posts which presented *otium cum dignitate*, enabled him to devote himself more entirely to theological literature.

Though in 1724 he had prepared a "Commentary which was intended to assist students of all nations in acquiring more accurate knowledge of the Christian Scriptures," he kept this work by him for a space of eighteen years before he gave it to the public, his *Gnomon* not being published till the year 1742. And during all these years it appears to have received continual accessions, if not of bulk, at least of new ideas and greater accuracy, as the continual reference we find in his *Gnomon*, to works published in the interval, shews.

The same habit of annotating, with a view to his exegetical work, was continued to the end of his life. His son-in-law, John Charles Frederic Burk, had been, as Bengel tells us at the end of his preface to the *Gnomon*, for many years in daily intercourse with him, and had been something like his Tertius. To him were committed the papers by which his *Gnomon* became what it was, in 1759, about seven years after his death.

The labours of Bengel, as a critic, have been nearly superseded, but his *Gnomon* has fully maintained its position in the regard of all those who have remained loyal to the truth of the Divine Word. And if this publication, by the Messrs. Clark, is only the means of leading to the study of Bengel on the part of those who have become addicted to the more superficial and questionable aids of modern times, it will confer no small benefit on the age. Much as we may regret that persons who aspire to an acquaintance with the original Scriptures

should need the aid of a translation, it is well, if that need exists, that it should be as substantially supplied as it will be by this work. The gentlemen into whose hands it has been committed are well qualified to do it justice. Besides Mr. Fausset, to whose responsible revision the whole work is entrusted, and who supplies a portion of the translation and notes, the Rev. J. Bandinel, M.A., of Wadham, takes the preface and the notes on St. Matthew's Gospel; the Rev. J. Boyce, late of Aberdeen, from Romans to Hebrews; the Rev. Dr. Fletcher, Head Master of Wimborne Grammar School, from St. James to Revelation. The original notes are by the Editor and Mr. Bandinel. The volumes published, i. and iii., include the preface and Bengel's notes on the two first Gospels in volume i., and his notes on the Epistle to the Romans and the two to the Corinthians. The remainder of the work, in three additional volumes, is to appear shortly. We can scarcely doubt that the enterprize of Messrs. Clark will, in this case, be well rewarded.

Signor Vercellone's Preface to Cardinal Mai's Edition of the Codex Vaticanus. Rome. 1857.

THE edition of the *Codex Vaticanus* promised by Cardinal Mai, has been so long delayed that the appearance of the *Preface* to the intended work, now issued as a kind of Prospectus, is worthy of notice, even though it may seem something like reviewing a publication before it has been issued, or even seen.

This preface is issued by Carlo Vercellone, a Barnabite at Rome, into whose hands the executors of Cardinal Mai, Cardinal Prince Luigi Altieri, and Don Domenico Mostacci, have placed the edition of the *Codex Vaticanus*, to be examined, revised with the MS. itself, and actually *published*—an event so often expected, that scepticism may seem justifiable, until the work actually is issued for sale.

It is however promised that this shall take place speedily; and meanwhile we are informed what was done by Cardinal Mai, the condition in which the edition was left at the time of his death, Sept. 9, 1854, and what the new editor has effected, and what he proposes to accomplish.

It must first be observed, that the expectations of those who supposed that this would be a *fac simile* edition, will be wholly disappointed; it will not take a place by the side of the publications of Woide, Kipling, Baber, and Tischendorf; it will rather rank with Grabe's edition of the *Codex Alexandrinus*.

We are informed by Signor Vercellone, that Cardinal Mai commenced the preparation for his edition of the *Codex Vaticanus* in 1828; he then indicates some of the causes of this long delay, stating that others will be mentioned in Mai's own words.

In the Old Testament, as is well known, the MS. is defective, so far as the original writing is concerned, at the beginning until Gen. xlv. 28; also from Psalm cv. 27 to Psalm cxxxvii. 6: these defects

were supplied by Mai from other MSS. in Genesis, and from the recent writings of the *Codex* itself in the Psalms.

The portions of St. Paul's epistles which are wanting in the MS. are supplied from a recent MS. in the same library (192 Scholz), and the Apocalypse from the MS. noted B in that book, the text of which was published (but not in a *fac simile* edition) by Tischendorf.

In the Apocrypha Mai also added the books of Maccabees from a MS. in the Vatican.

All these additions are simply intended to supply defects in the MS. as it now exists, so as to repair the injury inflicted by time. In a *fac simile* edition such procedures would have been needless, but as Mai's object was simply to furnish an edition of the LXX. and the Greek New Testament, fitted for common use, he thought that, without such supplements, this object would not have been attained.

But the additions made are not all of this kind; Mai has not been content with repairing the injuries of time with inferior and, in part at least, incongruous materials. In the New Testament he has boldly introduced into the text certain passages which do not belong to the MS., and which the copyist, advisedly, did not insert. Thus, he has added Mark xvi. 9—20; Acts xxviii. 29; Matt. xii. 47; Mark xv. 28; Luke xxii. 43, 44; xxiii. 17, 34; John v. 3, 4; vii. 53—viii. 12; 1 Pet. v. 3; 1 JOHN v. 7. In the Old Testament he has also added Exod. xxvi. 12, 21; xxviii. 11; xxxvi. 27; xxxviii. 5; Deut. xii. 27; xiv. 25; xxii. 3; 4 Kings xxv. 10. In all these places it is of course noted, that the text of the *Codex* has not been given, and Signor Vercellone remarks, that the same plan might have been carried farther, and such places as Exod. iv. 26; Matt. xxiii. 14; Acts. xxiv. 7, 8, might have been added. In this plan all notion of giving the text of a particular MS. seems to be useless, and the object might (on such principles) be as well attained by a mere statement of the various readings of the document.

The real LXX. of Daniel is given by Mai from the MS. in the Chigi Palace, as well as that of Theodotion, which has so long taken its place as part of the LXX. version.

We are informed that the printing of the edition was completed about 1838: there has thus been a delay of twenty years, and this is accounted for very partially.

Signor Vercellone tells us that Cardinal Mai was convinced that his edition, unless it were carefully revised, would be of but little benefit to critical studies, because it was not sufficiently accurate (*"utpote quæ non satis accurata evasisset"*). For he was well aware that accurate care was needed in anything of this kind, and *this he was not able himself to bestow*, and this the compositors too often neglected. Therefore he thought best that the whole should be suppressed until he should be able to collate the whole with the MS. Accordingly, he is said to have spent a great deal of time, having a person to read aloud the printed sheets, while he, with the *Codex* before him, noted everything that required correction. Vercellone says, that as the

Cardinal could not devote many hours in a week to this work, it is no wonder that it occupied many years. And yet it seems strange that for sixteen years the Cardinal should have had the printed edition completed, and yet this revision should have been unfinished: he seems, by this account, to have exhibited much less zeal than he did as to other publications; the slowness of this contrasts rather strangely with the rapidity with which he issued his *Scriptores Veteres* (10 vols. 4to), *Classici Auctores* (10 vols. 8vo), *Spicilegium Romanum* (10 vols. 8vo), *Bibliotheca Nova Patrum* (7 vols. 4to).

But it seems strange that so much revision should have been needed, and that the original printing should have been so incorrect: it is at least remarkable, that in so important a work as this, the execution should have been left in other hands, so as to make the Cardinal's editorship only nominal.

Signor Vercellone, in a foot-note to his preface, partly explains this: he informs us that a copy of the common Sixtine edition of the LXX. (of which the *Codex Vaticanus* was the basis, though many Aldine readings were introduced through oversight) was put into the hands of the compositors, and then the plan was to correct the proof sheets by the Vatican MS., so as to extrude the Sixtine readings, which vary from the Archetype; it can, therefore, be no cause for surprize, that as Mai was not able (we are informed) to exercise personal care and attention, the Sixtine readings were often not extruded, and the true text of the MS. remained unnoticed.

What was placed in the compositors' hands in the New Testament (by far the more important part) we are not told: there is, however, reason to fear, that not much more care was taken to ensure exactitude there than was the case in the LXX.

Everything, therefore, turns on the revision bestowed, first by Mai and now by Vercellone. Mai thought that by pen and ink corrections the edition might be made such as it ought to be: however, before his death, he was decided that some leaves must be reprinted: Vercellone now mentions, in a note, *a hundred pages* that he has found it needful to reprint.

Vercellone states, that he is now occupied in examining the printed pages with the MS.,—not however throughout, but only in many parts; and thus, besides the cancelled leaves, we may expect a considerable list of corrections to be subjoined to each of the five volumes. It is more to be desired, than to be expected, that sufficient care will be bestowed on the examination of those places where the MS. has received some correction.

The publication of this edition, though a *text* and not the *fac simile* of a MS., will be of some value; it will, at times, enable us to form a judgment on the New Testament as to the true reading of the *Codex*, where the existing collations are discrepant: it may remove hindrances to the use of the MS. itself on the part of scholars; if so, the labour requisite for executing a *fac simile* edition will be by no means superfluous: such a work would be worthy of the industry of a scholar who

desired to emulate the diligence of Tischendorf; it might be an undertaking such as might call forth new efforts on the part of Tischendorf himself.

The work is announced as being in five quarto volumes; and the price named is 40 Roman *scudi* for copies on common paper, 50 *scudi* for those on better paper; that is, respectively, *eight* and *ten guineas*.

The Ancient Melodies of the Liturgy of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews. Harmonized by EMANUEL AGUILAR; with an Essay on the Poets, Poetry, and Melodies of the Sephardic Liturgy. By the Rev. D. A. DE SOLA. Groombridge and Sons.^a

THE history of the Jewish Liturgies offers many points of interest to the student of archæology and literature, apart from the religious associations of the venerable rituals. In Germany Dr. Zunz, Dr. M. Sachs, M. Steinschneider, and other learned men, have devoted great erudition and industry to the investigation and elucidation of these remarkable literary remains of former times. It is only within the last fifty years that these researches have occupied continental scholars, and in this country they have yet attracted little attention. On the importance of the subject it is needless to offer arguments. Scattered throughout every land, the Jews have retained their own traditions and usages, and though the original language of the nation is only employed in their public services, they possess many written records beside which the oldest literary treasures of some of the Christian nations of Europe are comparatively modern. The study of these ancient remains, in themselves full of interest, may also throw light upon the general history and literature of the times to which they belong. This is especially the case in regard to the liturgies of Spain and of Southern Europe. At that epoch of which we northern nations are accustomed to speak as the "dark ages," the light of learning shone brightly in Spain under the liberal protection of the Moorish sway. For several centuries previous to the conquest of Grenada by Ferdinand and Isabella, a succession of illustrious Jewish poets and philosophers brought honour to the Spanish nation. Gabirol, Judah Ha-levi, and Aben Ezra, are probably the names known to most scholars. Solomon Ben Judah Ben Babirol, flourished at Saragossa when William the Conqueror reigned in England. Judah Ha-levi was born at Toledo in the year 1105. The exact dates of the birth and the death of Moses Aben Ezra are unknown, but he was still alive in 1138. His fame was far spread as a poet, and as the most learned man of his time in Jewish theology and Greek philosophy. In our regrets that such men were hostile to the Christian faith, let it be considered with what miserable idolatry and superstition the idea of Christianity was in those days associated. Judaism and Mahometanism

^a This review is from the *Literary Gazette*, and is so full on the subject that we prefer it to any notice of our own.—ED. J. S. L.

were pure creeds compared with the so-called Christianity, which exhibited every lust and folly in its institutions, and in its proselytism displayed an intolerance and cruelty which the Moslems had long since abandoned. On the fields of Spain, at least, the Christians were the barbarians, and the crusades brought destruction to philosophy and art, and all liberal learning. These revolutions were of course necessary in the designs of Providence, but we may not the less look back with admiration to the brilliant times of the Moslem empire in Spain, in the literary renown of which the Jews bore a distinguished part. From the end of the tenth to the end of the fifteenth centuries many poets of celebrity flourished, whose hymns still have a place in the Jewish liturgies. According to Zunz the productions of the five most popular of the Sephardic poets, whose works became a part of public worship, to the number of a thousand pieces, have been introduced into various liturgies. M. L. Dukes had previously given a list of upwards of two hundred hymnic poets, and Professor Luzzato of Padua had enumerated more than double the number. It must be observed, however, that some of these are modern compositions, and the liturgies of Algiers, Oran, Tripoli, and northern Africa, as well as the German, Italian, and Polish liturgies, contain many hymns that were never admitted into the Sephardic liturgy in use in the synagogues of the Spanish and Portuguese Jews. It is of the Sephardic poets and poetry alone that the history is given in the present work by the Rev. D. A. De Sola, minister of the Spanish and Portuguese congregation of Jews in Bevis Marks, London. It is the first separate treatise we have heard of on the poetical parts of the Sephardic liturgy, and the value of the work is greatly increased by the publication of the melodies, some of them as ancient as the hymns, which are in use in the synagogues of the Spanish Jews. The chants and melodies have been harmonized by Mr. Aguilar, who wrote them from hearing Mr. De Sola sing them, according to the traditionary versions used in Amsterdam and in London.

As the subject may be altogether new to some of our readers, we may here explain the origin of the term Sephardic Liturgy as connected with the Spanish and Portuguese Jews. The name is derived from the singular prophecy in the Book of Obadiah, v. 20, where, in foretelling the regions to be occupied by the tribe of the Jews after their dispersion, it is said "The captivity of Jerusalem which is in Shepharad shall possess the cities of the south," or as the marginal reading has it, the exiles of Jerusalem "shall possess the land which is in Shepharad," and the cities of the south. The Vulgate reads arbitrarily "in Bosphorum," but the Syriac and Chaldee, and all the oldest Jewish annotators, fix this passage as pointing to a transmigration or deportation "in Hesperias." The history of the settlement of the Jews in the south-west of Europe, and their long prosperity in that region, is a remarkable commentary on the words of the ancient prophet. Nor need we add that the Sephardim retain their idea of superiority over other branches of their co-religionists, as possessing

the form of worship used by the Jews in the epoch of their highest prosperity since their removal from their own land. How far this feeling is justified we are not called upon here to consider, our object being chiefly to examine Mr. De Sola's interesting work in its bearings on literature and art.

At what exact period the use of hymns by non-inspired writers first was introduced into the regular synagogue service it is difficult now to determine. For many centuries after the dispersion, the Psalms and other portions of the sacred Scriptures were alone admitted as the medium of devotion in its various forms of prayer and praise, penitence and worship. It was probably from the Arabs that the use of metrical poetry was derived, as the Jews diligently studied the language and literature of that people, then at the head of civilization. Saadiah Gaon, who died A.D. 942, is the first who is known to have introduced rhyme into Hebrew verse. The innovation was soon adopted in various lands, and especially in Spain. Mr. De Sola enumerates the most noted poets of the Hebrew-Spanish School, and points out the works of each in the Sephardic liturgy. The earlier poets seem to have most closely adhered to the language of the inspired writers, passages of Scripture being introduced in their hymns. Here are two of the hymns for the first time translated into English:—

“ שַׁחַר אֲבָקֶשְׁכָּה *Shachar Abakeshcha.*

“ In the early morn I seek Thee, my Refuge and Rock !

And address unto Thee my morning and evening prayers.

“ When contemplating Thy greatness, I remain and stand amazed ;

For to Thine all-seeing eyes my innermost thoughts are revealed.

“ How feeble is the power of heart and tongue to conceive and praise Thy might,

And how inadequate that of the spirit which is within me !

“ Yet Thou deignest to accept the praise of mortal man,

Therefore will I praise Thee, whilst Thy divine spirit shall animate me.—In the early morn, etc.

* * * * *

“ שַׁבָּת הַיְמָן. כִּישְׁמֶרָה שַׁבָּת *Kieshmera Shabat.*

“ When the Sabbath I duly keep,

God will also guard me ;

For an eternal covenant and ‘ sign

It is between Him and me.’

“ Thereon it is prohibited to transact business, to travel, to discuss political, commercial, or private affairs. But I must meditate in the divine law, that its instructions may improve my knowledge.—When the Sabbath. etc.

“ On that day I find rest for my soul. Behold, to a former generation the Most Holy gave a wondrous sign, by granting them a double portion on every sixth day. May He also on that day ever double my portion.

“ It was commanded to his chiefs and priesthood to arrange thereon, according to law, the shewbread before Him ; but to fast on that day has been prohibited by the sages, except it be the Day of Atonement for our sins.

“ This glorious day is one of delights, which we also honour by the enjoyment of savoury food and drink. The afflicted must on that day abstain from mourning, for it is a day of joy, on which God caused me to rejoice.

"He who works on that day will assuredly be cut off. Therefore will I purify my heart of every unseemly thought. I will pray to the Almighty evening and morning, address to Him the additional and afternoon prayers, that He may answer me!"

Gradually greater diversity of composition appeared, and a style prevailed against which the graver rabbis vehemently protested. There are fewer of these secular and "profane" allusions in the Sephardic than in other Jewish liturgies. The best paytans or poets, however, used the acrostics, and alliterations and alphabetical arrangements of the beginnings of the lines and stanzas, of which the inspired Psalms themselves present remarkable examples. It is by the acrostics that the names of the composers of some of the hymns are known. Sometimes the name of a poet's father and his native place is skilfully recorded by the same management of the acrostic art, and also the purpose and occasion for which the poem was written. These, and other literary peculiarities of the hymnic poems and fragments of the liturgy, are carefully elucidated in Mr. De Sola's introductory essay.

The melodies to which these poems are chanted or sung are not less interesting to the student. Some of them are ancient Spanish and Moorish melodies which have thus been preserved for nearly a thousand years. Against the adoption of these tunes the rabbis made frequent but vain protests. Aben Ezra says, in speaking of the works of Judah Ha-levi, that "in his days it became a practice to introduce into liturgical works hymns founded on popular melodies." He mentions, as instances, the tune of "En toda la tramoñtana," a love ditty well known in Spain, and "El Vaquero de la Morayna," the Cowherd of the Morayna. These hymns seem to have been intended, however, by the paytans chiefly for private exercises of devotion, in the spirit of Rowland Hill's saying, that "he did not see why the devil should have all the best tunes to himself." There is no doubt that some of the Sephardic melodies are of great antiquity, and they have long since lost, in this country at least, their secular associations, so that their use in public worship does not interfere with the most solemn devotional feeling. Tradition also affirms that certain melodies still in use are identical with those sung in the Temple. This is said of the melody of the Blessing of the Priests (ברכה כהנים) which is supposed to be the same in which priestly choirs were wont to bless the people, agreeably to the command in Numbers vi. 22—26.

"That this tradition," says Mr. De Sola, "is supported by great probability, almost amounting to direct proof, will appear from the following considerations: first, that this duty devolved exclusively on the priests, who were a numerous class, who executed it with religious awe and attention, and who, as a privilege peculiar to themselves, scrupulously transmitted it to their sons. It is therefore highly improbable that on the restoration of public divine service, the priests would have used, or the people would have permitted them to introduce, any other melody except the venerated one of the Temple, especially as the blessing of the people was the only art of ministration remaining to the priests after the destruction of the Sanctuary. Secondly, we find that, with slight alteration, this blessing is sung to the same melody in every Sephardic congregation. And though our brethren following the German liturgy have more than one melody for it, they seem to be of comparatively modern introduction; and one of them, said to be the most ancient, contains unmistakeable traces of this,

which we must consider to be the original melody. Its simplicity, and the repetition of the same melody for all the words of the blessing (fifteen in number), are circumstances which will have their due weight, and will be accepted as additional and corroborative evidence for its antiquity by the musical archæologist and critic."

Other melodies in the collection appear certainly to be of older date than the settlement of the Jews in Spain. The greater number, however, were composed in Spain, and have thus an additional interest as records of the musical taste and art of the Moorish period of the Peninsular history. Mr. De Sola has admitted few melodies of a more recent composition into his book, although some of these that may be heard in the Dutch and other synagogues have a plaintive and solemn melody not unworthy of the older hymns. One melody of his own composition, which has been well received by the Sephardic congregations in London, the Hague, and America, the author modestly gives in an appendix.

It would be impossible to give any clear idea of the nature or style of the Sephardic melodies by mere description, but the harmonies arranged by Mr. Aguilar may direct the attention of musicians to the subject. The written tunes may never have come before Handel, Haydn, Mendelssohn, and other modern masters of sacred music, but they must assuredly have sometimes caught the strains of some of these ancient Jewish melodies. In former times, even more than now, the number of learned Jews who embraced the Christian faith was great, as the records of all the most renowned universities of the Continent since the Reformation attest. Indirectly in this way also the tradition of old national melodies may have been diffused, and the themes taken up and worked out by professional composers. But on their own merit, and in the form still used in the public services of the sanctuary, the hymnic melodies of the Sephardic liturgy are worthy of study, and Mr. De Sola's work is one which will be equally welcome to the musician and the scholar.

Lexicon Linguae Syriacæ. Collegit, digessit, edidit, GEORGIUS HENRICUS BERNSTEIN. Vol. I., Fasc. I. (Syriac Lexicon. By G. H. BERNSTEIN). Berlin, 1857. Small folio, 144 columns.

THIS is the first instalment of the long expected Syriac Lexicon of Bernstein. The learned world have been looking forward to it for thirty years, and at last its veteran author has succeeded in sending forth the portion now before us. Every one who knows anything of Syriac literature is aware that its lexicography is in a most unsatisfactory state. We are not aware that any general dictionary of the language has been published since 1788, when Michaelis published an amended and separate edition of that by Edmund Castell. This most unsatisfactory and imperfect work has been the only one available for common use, although the additions made to the published literature of the language have greatly added to the stock of words.

Dr. Bernstein has made a noble commencement, but we calculate

that at least thirty parts like the present will be required to complete the work, which will, therefore, be very expensive. We trust, however, that considering on the one hand the great cost of the publication, and on the other hand its great importance, all Oriental scholars will be prompt to support the undertaking. Those who have been in the habit of reading Syriac books, and more particularly such as have been recently published from original manuscripts, must have observed how many words occurred which were not in existing lexicons. Dr. Bernstein's work will, we expect, include all these. But still, we believe that further researches into the existing literature of the language, will reveal many words and forms which are now unknown to us, and that, consequently, even this lexicon, although so greatly augmented from new sources, will from time to time require supplements, registering and elucidating the new words and idioms which come to light.

Dr. Bernstein's book is beautifully printed, and every word is illustrated by copious references. There is one thing, however, which we venture to say *pace tanti viri*, that, for practical purposes, the work would have been more easy of reference, especially to ordinary students, if the arrangement adopted had been that of Gesenius in his *Lexicon*, strictly alphabetical, with references to the radicals. Whereas the plan resembles that of the older lexicographers, who give the roots in their alphabetical order, and under each, also in alphabetical order, the derivatives from them. However, we hail with great pleasure and satisfaction the commencement of a work, the progress of which we shall watch with intense interest, and the conclusion of which, we hope, will come within a reasonable period.

Commentary on the Books of Kings. By KARL FRIEDRICH KEIL, D.D., Ph.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in the University of Dorpat. Translated by JAMES MURPHY, LL.D., Professor of Hebrew, Belfast. Supplemented by *Commentary on the Books of Chronicles*, by ERNST BERTHEAU, Professor in Göttingen. Translated by JAMES MARTIN, B.A., Edinburgh. In two Volumes. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark. 1857. 8vo. pp. 458, 468.

THESE volumes form part of the issue of the *Foreign Theological Library* for 1857, and we are glad that Messrs. Clark have supplied what is really a *desideratum* in English. Of commentaries on the Old Testament we have indeed plenty, but they are mostly rather collections of short sermons than exegetical aids—more for the pulpit or the closet than for the study;—Adam Clarke excepted, who is yet far below the mark as a learned interpreter. These writers on the Kings and Chronicles may be said to do for these venerable records of the older Church what is accomplished by our accredited exegetical helps on the Greek Testament. The Hebrew text, and not a translation, is made the basis of the commentary, and the meaning of the sacred writer is evolved with all the aid which learning can afford. We are

pleased to be able to add that a reverential piety guides the pen of both Keil and Bertheau. We cannot now do more than introduce the volumes to our readers; with the addition of the Introduction to Kiel by Dr. Murphy.

“A separate Commentary on the Books of Kings has been much wanted in the English language. This want has now, for the first time, been supplied in a very able manner by the following work. Its author has devoted much of his time and attention to the elucidation of the Old Testament, and he is one of the safest of German commentators. His *Apologetischer Versuch über die Chronik*, Berlin, 1833, was a very important contribution towards this object, and prepared the way for the present treatise, which appeared in 1846. The author has since issued a *Commentary on the Book of Joshua*, which appears in the series of the *Foreign Theological Library* for this year. *An Introduction to the Old Testament* also came from his pen in 1853. The present work, as well as all the others, is distinguished by a sober, judicious, and careful investigation of the meaning of the text, a large and well selected array of solid information, and a firm attachment to evangelical doctrines. The reader may not accord with his opinions or conclusions on every point; but he cannot fail to reap much benefit from his well-directed labours, and to acknowledge his valuable aid in the study of this important portion of Holy Scripture. The translator has only to express his hope that the meaning of the author has been throughout correctly and plainly conveyed to the English reader,”

A Plain Commentary on the Book of Psalms, chiefly founded on the Fathers. In Two Volumes. Oxford and London: Parkers. 1857. 18mo. pp. 512, 520.

THE Prayer-Book version is the basis of this Commentary, which is thus principally intended for members of the Church of England. But it would be wrong for it to be imagined that no advantage is given to the reader by that ancient version from the Vulgate, which contains some fine renderings, and has more authority than some are willing to concede to it. Mr. Procter (*History of the Book of Common Prayer*) says, “The version used in the Psalter is the old translation of the Bible—that of Tyndale and Coverdale (1535) and Rogers (1537)—which was revised by Cranmer (1539), and published in a large volume, and placed in the churches with the royal sanction.”

This Commentary is in a very slight degree exegetical, but it aims rather at the pious improvement of the devout reader. The author says, that “the attempt has been not to make a perfect Commentary which should supersede all others, but to write, or to gather from the best and holiest sources, such plain explanations, spiritual improvements and interpretations, as should form a Commentary which any one, however young and unlearned, might take up, and after he had read it might feel that he knew somewhat more of the meaning, and entered somewhat more into the spirit of any Psalm than he had been able to do before.” Looked at from this humble, yet most important point of view, we think the object has been gained; and pious readers who use the volumes will be pleased and edified by having put before them the way in which St. Augustine, and the Church in his day, extracted benefit from the Psalter.

There are some valuable introductions in the work, and from that of the second volume we extract the following:—

“The care with which the Psalter was preserved in the sacred canon, and the reverence with which it was regarded, prove that it was no mere collection of popular or striking poems. The Israelites had such, which contained praises of their heroes, and the histories of their mighty deeds, like the book of Jasher; they had also poems embodying the wisdom of science and the knowledge of nature, as the verses of Solomon on natural history, but these have all perished. They served their turn in the education of the people, and were lost: but the Book of Psalms remains, through the will and decree of God, as an inheritance of the Church of the elect for all times.

“The Christian Church received this inheritance from the Jewish. The example of the Saviour, who sang with his disciples the Psalms of ‘the Great Hallel,’ on the night when the commemorative Passover gave place for ever to the Eucharistic Sacrament, became a law to the whole Church, and his apostles closely followed the practice of their Lord. Paul and Silas, when they said their form of midnight prayer, sang psalms to God aloud, probably the very psalms which they had always been used to sing at that time of prayer. The same St. Paul bids the Churches both of Ephesus and Colosse to use psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs, singing them melodiously and heartily, and, as the original would seem to imply, in alternate verses, unto God. St. James, too, bids the man who is glad of heart to shew his gladness by singing psalms. The use of the Psalter, therefore, as the appointed form of Christian devotion, spread with the spreading of the Church, east and west.”

The Elements of Hebrew Grammar; together with an Appendix on Chaldee Grammar. By JAMES G. MURPHY, LL.D., Trinity College, Dublin. London: Nutt. 12mo.

JUDGING from the number of Hebrew grammars which continue to make their appearance, one might think that every tyro in the language supposed himself equal to the task of writing its grammar. Second thoughts, however, convince us this would be a mistake, since few books have a shorter life than English Hebrew grammars. Probably, the larger part of them never pay for publishing. Still their continued production is a sign of something, and that must be the interest which is felt in the sacred language. Dr. Murphy adds one to the list; and he is no tyro, but a man well grounded in the doctrines of the language he teaches. He has very naturally felt the want of adaptation in many existing grammars, and has endeavoured, first, to find out what that want consists in, and, secondly, to supply it. To say that he has produced a better grammar than many we know, would be faint praise. And to say that he has succeeded in his object would be premature. The former is very evident, and we hope the latter, but time alone will prove it. We like the principles on which he proceeds, and think it very important they should be recognized by every teacher of Hebrew. In many respects we approve of the plan and execution of his work, which does him honour. Still, there are some little matters of arrangement and expression which might, in our opinion, be improved. With this exception we cordially recommend the book, as one which evinces not only pains but thought in its compilation, and as calculated to be very useful under the guidance of a competent tutor.

Voices from the Rocks ; or, Proofs of the existence of Man during the Palæozoic, or most ancient Period of the Earth. A Reply to the late Hugh Miller's "Testimony of the Rocks." London : Judd and Glass. 12mo.

THIS work is not properly a reply to Hugh Miller's book, to which indeed but few references are made, for the very obvious reason, that it was written before the other was published. The writer is an earnest and intelligent man, who has done his utmost to overthrow the received opinions of modern geologists respecting the antiquity of the earth. He believes that the present stratification of the earth was caused by the Noachic deluge, and adduces a variety of arguments in support of that opinion, one of the principal being the alleged discovery of human remains in a fossilized state. We have carefully read the work, and highly commend the spirit and manner of the author, who says all that can well be said for his theory. At the same time we think it would not be difficult to shew the utter untenableness of his position, and that modern geology, in its leading principles, is founded on a scientific basis so broad and firm that a few isolated and questionable facts cannot overthrow it. We are not sorry to see the gauntlet thus thrown down, it may do good in more ways than one.

Notæ Critæ in Versionem Septuagintaviralem, Liber Numerorum. CURANTE GULIELMO SELWYN, S. T. B., Dominæ Margaretæ in Sacra Theologiâ Lectore. Cantabrigiæ : Deighton et Soc. 1857. 8vo. pp. 92.

The Books of Numbers and Deuteronomy, according to the Version of the LXX. Translated into English, with Notices of its Omissions and Insertions, and with Notes on the Passages in which it differs from our Authorized Translation. By the Hon. and very Rev. HENRY E. J. HOWARD, D.D., Dean of Lichfield. Cambridge : Macmillans. 1857. 8vo. pp. 430.

WE have before introduced to our readers the former parts of both these contributions to the literature of the Septuagint, and have much pleasure in recording the progress of labours which cannot fail to promote sound Biblical learning. We reiterate what we have said on other occasions, that a wide field for Biblical exegesis yet remains untilled in reference to the Septuagint and its relations to the Hebrew Text, and the attention which is now being given to this department of study by the Universities, cannot fail of proving advantageous in many respects.

Professor Selwyn gives another collection of *Testimonia Patrum in Veteres Interpretes*, which will be found highly interesting, and will prove, if any proof is needed, the high estimation in which the Greek Version was held in the early ages of the Church. The Septuagint was then considered quite sufficient to decide "controversies in matters

of faith ;" and the ancient fathers would be introduced to a field of controversy altogether unknown to them in their day, if they could see how *authority* is now almost confined to the Hebrew.

Dean Howard refers in his preface to the work of Dr. Wall, which was slightly noticed in the last number of this Journal. He seems to attach some importance to Dr. Wall's theory of the corruption of the Hebrew Text by the later Jews; but we must say again that we think it is far too late in the day to ventilate this subject with any hope of separating any wheat from the chaff.

The Israel of the Alps; a complete history of the Vaudois of Piedmont and their Colonies; prepared in great part from unpublished documents. By ALEXIS MUSTON, D.D., Pastor of the Protestant Church of Bordeaux, Drôme, France. Translated by the Rev. JOHN MONTGOMERY, A.M. With numerous Illustrations. In 2 volumes. London and Glasgow: Blackie. 1857. 8vo. pp. 508, 556.

THE zeal and industry of Dr. Muston have well nigh exhausted the subject of his researches; certainly they have produced a history of a highly attractive character, notwithstanding the wickedness and sorrow it unfolds. The author writes very graphically; producing pictures often highly coloured; yet we cannot say that by this process the truth is distorted. He has indeed his subjectivities,—and who has not?—and some controversies might doubtless be raised on some of his statements. The work is well translated, and the illustrations of Vaudois scenery are very charming. Altogether Messrs. Blackie have done good service by bringing this work before the English public at so low a price.

Bible Studies, conducted on the principle of a progressive development in Divine Teaching. By J. H. TITCOMB, M.A., of St. Peter's College, Cambridge. London: Parker and Son. 1857. 12mo. pp. 502.

MR. TITCOMB rightly observes that his work meets "a great want in our Bible Literature." He is aware that the subject he discusses has been recognized often enough, and he mentions Sherlock and Warburton, and Seiler, as alluding to, and illustrating, the doctrine of the progressive and successive nature of divine Revelation, "But notwithstanding these admissions and complaints," he says, "the press does not appear to have produced any work in which the Bible has been systematically analyzed on such a principle. Particular branches of the subject have been, no doubt, treated in this way, as, for example, the Christology of the Old Testament. But I am not aware that any author has yet undertaken a review of the sacred books with the simple object of tracing a gradual and chronological development of divine teaching throughout them."

Now this principle must be admitted to be a correct one, as regards God's dealings from age to age, but it requires great discrimination not to run into errors and fancies, if it is applied to the *successive books* of Holy Scripture in the order in which we now have them. We may presume that both in the Old and New Testaments, the same divine care which caused the books to be written, also superintended their allocation; yet the fact that the *ordo* has not always been the same, especially in the MSS. of the New Testament, would prevent a discreet interpreter from laying too much stress upon it. We do not think that Mr. Titcomb has done this: he has rather arranged the great periods, than founded anything on the place of individual books. Thus, he divides the Old Testament period into eight epochs, as follow:—I. From the Fall to the call of Abraham. II. To the bondage in Egypt. III. To the entrance into Canaan. IV. To the establishment of the Monarchy. V. To the revolt of the ten tribes. VI. To the Assyrian captivity and the destruction of Jerusalem. VII. The period of the captivity. VIII. From the restoration out of Babylon to the close of the Old Testament Canon.

Under these heads the author institutes a very careful examination of the theology, ethics, &c. of the various periods, and proves himself to be a close and devout student of the Holy Scriptures. He is, therefore, quite justified in saying, "these pages were not put together at random. I call them Bible Studies, because they have been the result of much labour and research. They ought not, therefore, to be taken up in a hasty manner. Unless the texts are referred to as the reader goes forward, and each part of the book is properly compared by him with the Bible constantly at his side, I am sure he will not receive the profit it is calculated to give, or appreciate the object it is designed to unfold." Without pledging ourselves to all Mr. Titcomb's opinions, we are able cordially to recommend his volume, as fully adequate to the purpose for which he has designed it, as "becoming useful to the pupil teachers in our training colleges, to the conductors of Bible classes in our young men's societies, and to the advanced teachers in our Sunday-schools. Indeed, I hope it may not be without its use to the more scholastic student of theology, particularly where he has access to the libraries which contain the works here quoted."

Letters to the Working Classes on important subjects. By One of Themselves. Glasgow: M'Phun. 1856. 18mo. pp. 234.

THE author says:—"He who reads this book will at once see that the desire and aim of the author has been to meet the objections and refute the arguments of infidels, in a calm and considerate manner, so that young men may be able to give an answer to the infidel's objections."

We mention the book, because we think it may be found highly useful in large towns, where the classes spoken of are found to exist.

The Gathered Lilies. The Illuminations designed by Mrs. Howard Vyse and Miss Fanny Greville. The original poem by F. H. London: Hering. 1857. Oblong folio. pp. 13.

The Prince of Peace; or, Lays of Bethlehem. Selected from the British Poets. Illustrated. London: Seeleys. 1857. 8vo. pp. 176.

WE have only space just to notice these beautiful books, each excellent in its separate department. The illumination of the first constitutes its value; the poetry of the second is of the choicest kind, and it is adorned and illustrated by many fine engravings.

The Encyclopædia Britannica. Vol. XIV. M A G—M I H. Edinburgh: A. and C. Black. 4to.

THIS valuable work is keeping on its way as rapidly as is consistent with completeness of information. All the articles on which the march of years has thrown fresh light, are either re-written or enlarged, and from the use of it ourselves, we can confidently recommend it to others, as a storehouse for reference on most subjects.

INTELLIGENCE,

BIBLICAL, EDUCATIONAL, LITERARY, AND MISCELLANEOUS.

On the Historical Dates of Ezra and Nehemiah.—While the difficulties which surround the history and times of the Asiatic rulers under the Jewish captivity are being considered, sifted, and re-adjusted, by the united labours of the eminent and indefatigable enquirers whose researches have already been submitted to the public in the pages of your journal, I will venture to offer a few remarks connected with the subject, to fix attention upon some points of the history which have not been touched in the papers that have appeared. The evidences of the facts I contend for can only be given by references; but every reader who wishes to verify my demonstration will thereby be enabled to do it with ease, so as to satisfy his own judgment whether the historical and chronological combinations those facts entail may be made available to stamp with condemnation the popular chronological system we have been used to follow, and to test the soundness of whatever new arrangement may be proposed in its place.

The leading positions assumed by the system which supplies the dates printed in the headings and margins of our Bibles, are:—

That the first year of Nebuchadnezzar, about which time the Jewish captivity of seventy years begins, is the year fixed by the compilers of Ptolemy's Canon as beginning January 21st, B.C. 604.

That the return of the captivity is in the year they fix for the first of Cyrus, beginning January 5th, B.C. 538.

That the "Artaxerxes, king of Persia" of Ezra and Nehemiah is Artaxerxes Longimanus, whose first year begins December 17th, B.C. 465.

The chronological test by which I propose to try these positions resides in the fact that Ezra and Nehemiah not only were both present at the return of the captivity in the first year of Cyrus, but also bore very leading parts in the religious ceremonies of the restoration. The passages of their history affirming their presence are so obvious, that they were noticed long ago by the authors of some chronological schemes now obsolete; but being found incompatible with the dates forced upon us by the compilers of the canon, the plain sense of these passages has been evaded by the framers of our current system. The following digest of the facts will shew how far the truth of Sacred History has been thus tampered with to accommodate the theories of men:—

Ezra is named in a list of priests among those who came back with Zerubbabel and Jeshua (Neh. xii. 1). Nehemiah is named in Ezra's list of the chiefs of the captives "which came with Zerubbabel" under the decree of Cyrus (Ezra ii. 1, 2). And Nehemiah sanctions Ezra's statement, by repeating it in his duplicate of the document (chap. vii. 5, *et seq.*), with the prefatory remark that it is "the register of those who came up *at the first*." This document introduces an explanatory account of the same transactions as Ezra's brief narrative. We cannot set aside the significance of Ezra's statement by deferring to a later period the proceedings he relates, viz., the opening of the religious year on the first day of the seventh civil month (Nisan or Abib), with the installation of the high priest Jeshua, the restoration of the national worship, and—*nota bene*—the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles in its season, "as it is written,"—for all this, according to Ezra, took place when "*the foundation of the temple was not yet laid*." It was laid in the second year (chap. iii. to v. 8).

Nehemiah's parallel narrative (chap. vii. 6 to xi.), when referred to this its right order in time, becomes an invaluable illustration of the history, by its telling us what Ezra omits, the distinguished part borne by Ezra himself on that solemn occasion, as chief teacher and interpreter of the law to the people. The plea of *alibi* is thus barred against Ezra, as effectually as against Nehemiah; the latter even informs us in that narrative that he is the *Tirshatha* (appointed

ruler) who restrained the ardour of the people from beginning the sacrifices until Jeshua was formally installed (chap. vii. 65), who assisted Ezra in carrying the prescriptions of the law into effect (chap. viii. 9), whose name—"Nehemiah, the Tirshatha, the son of Hachaliah," heads the list of those who ratified by a sealed covenant their public oath to observe and uphold that law (chap. x. 1). And the *identity* of the transactions in the two narratives, which is the point I contend for, is proved by the remark Nehemiah subjoins to his relation of the Feast of Tabernacles (chap. viii. 13—18), how, through Ezra's reading and expounding the law, the people learnt that it was written "that they should dwell in booths in the feast of the seventh month,"—"how the people went forth and brought boughs, and made themselves booths,"—"for," adds Nehemiah, "*since the days of Joshua the son of Nun, unto that day, had not the children of Israel done so.*" Now, as Ezra testifies that they had celebrated the Feast of Tabernacles, "*as it is written,*" at the return of the captivity, in the seventh month of the first year, before the foundation of the temple was laid; it follows that, unless the celebration related by Nehemiah were that very one, it could not have been what he avers it was—the *first* Feast of Tabernacles that had been kept, "*as it is written*"—*i. e.*, according to the forms of the Mosaic Law—"since the days of Joshua the son of Nun."

The high responsibility and authority of the duties laid on Ezra and Nehemiah at this important national era, further suggest that they could not be very young men at the time. This is borne out, as regards Ezra, by what we know of his parentage. His father, the high-priest Seraiah, and his elder brother Jozadak, had both been carried into captivity at the destruction of the temple by Nebuzaradan, fifty-two years before (Conf. 2 Kings xxv. 18; 1 Chron. vi. 15). Ezra's nephew, Jeshua, the son of Jozadak, was officiating as high-priest, for which the law ordains that he should be not under thirty years of age. The exceptional cases, in which an uncle may be his nephew's junior, can hardly be pleaded in this instance, considering that the chiefs, and elders, and Levites, had chosen Ezra, as the most learned among their priests and scribes in the language of their fathers, to expound the law in public.

Now what ensues from combining the historical facts in their order of occurrence according to the Bible with the dates fixed to them according to our common chronology?

Ezra being, say forty years of age in the first of Cyrus, B.C. 538, we have him in the seventh of Artaxerxes, B.C. 459—8 (Ezra ix. 3), venting his grief and indignation at the breach of covenant and profanation of the priesthood, by "plucking out the hair of his head and his beard." A man upwards of a hundred and twenty years old has not many spare locks to devote to such demonstrations! We are reminded of Wordsworth's *rencontre*—

"I saw before me, unawares,
The oldest man that ever wore grey hairs."

All his faculties are as indestructible as his *chevelure*, since we find him still extant fourteen years later—in the twenty-second year of Artaxerxes—at the dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, rebuilt in fifty-two days, under the auspices of a Nehemiah whose humanity seems equally exempt from the law of decay; for on this occasion they both march in procession round the wall to the temple, Ezra leading one band of trumpeters and harpers, Nehemiah following with the other (Neh. xii. 35, 38). After all this, Nehemiah continues twelve years Governor of Judæa—no sinecure post, by his own account—and then, although rather superannuated, so far from worn out by toils and tribulations, and the persecutions of Sanballat the Horonite, Tobiah the Ammonite, and Geshem the Arabian, that in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes he returns to his royal master's court—*ætat.* 150 or thereabouts—to ask leave to go back again to Jerusalem!

Such incongruous results could scarcely escape the notice of the framers of our chronological system; but what was to be done? If the date they fixed for Cyrus and the restoration could not be moved, and that of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus could not be moved, how were they to get off the horns of this dilemma?

"Voulez-vous être invincible dans votre argument? niez l'évidence!" advises a sarcastic French philosopher. So our chronologists were driven to explain away the presence of Nehemiah and Ezra at the restoration, by supposing dislocations of the narrative, or transpositions of fragments of the original texts that affirm it. This, however, cannot serve to sustain their position. The portion of text on which my argument rests (chapters i., ii., and iii. of Ezra) is free from break, either in the narrative or the text; his account is too concise and consecutive for the reader to confuse its parts; his dates are too clear to permit a doubt as to the succession of events, and the time to which they are referable—i. e., the return of the captivity "*at the first.*" Nehemiah, on the contrary, recounts two distinct histories, of which the second is retrospective. The first, his personal mission, in the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, to restore the walls of Jerusalem, is complete at chap. vii. 4. The census of the population he then proposes taking is the occasion for introducing the second (ver. 5), and having copied "the register of those who came at the first," he proceeds to report their doings up to the great convocation and day of fasting, humiliation and confession, held as soon as the Tabernacles were over, "on the twenty-fourth day of that month," says Nehemiah, ix. 1. This solemnity closes with the oath and covenant of the chiefs of the nation to observe and uphold the law. On that occasion Jeshua was the officiating high-priest, but at Nehemiah's coming to Jerusalem with the decree of Artaxerxes, and at the dedication of the wall, Eliashib, grandson of Jeshua, ministered (conf. Neh. iii. 1, 20). There is time for two generations of men between the first Feast of Tabernacles and sealing of the covenant, and the rebuilding and dedication of the wall. Yet our chronologists and commentators can only hide the rottenness of their scheme from their own eyes by dating *the whole* B.C. 446, in the year after that of Nehemiah's mission, as if the Feast of Tabernacles and the covenant were part of the ceremonies at the dedication of the wall. Thus they profess to illustrate sacred history by founding upon such a gross anachronism the very consistent story, that the Jewish captives had been restored to their land ninety-three years since the first of Cyrus, B.C. 538, and the temple had been rebuilt seventy-one years since the 6th of Darius, B.C. 516, before the people had so much as learnt from Ezra's interpretations of the law what the religious obligations of that law were, and had covenanted to fulfil them. *Credat Judæus!* No wonder Jewish commentators, who do study the sacred text, spurn such a chronology as that! and if the alternative must be to reject Ptolemy's canon in the form presented by its compilers, no wonder some do reject it!

In this maze of "confusion worse confounded," we cannot too gratefully appreciate the services which Mr. Bosanquet and the distinguished astronomers who have given their invaluable aid to the verification of this leading epoch have jointly conferred on the cause of truth and progress, by demonstrating that some portions of this vaunted canon, not fixed by eclipses, *must* be rejected as mere arbitrary arrangements of its compilers. Nevertheless, the difficulty of Ezra's and Nehemiah's appearance at the restoration is only reduced by thirty years, which still protracts their lives so far beyond the limits of probability, in the reign of "Artaxerxes, king of Persia," as to suggest the question, Can this be the Artaxerxes Longimanus whose reign begins B.C. 465? Mr. Bosanquet has already met this difficulty half way, by identifying Xerxes with the Artaxerxes of Ezra. But as Nehemiah mentions the thirty-second year of his sovereign, while Xerxes only has twenty-one in the canon, Mr. Bosanquet felt himself obliged to defer the mission of Nehemiah to the longer reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. This, under Mr. Bosanquet's date for the completion and dedication of the wall, B.C. 435, would find Ezra and Nehemiah officiating at upwards of one hundred and ten years of age, which is manifestly inadmissible.

There is a circumstance not hitherto noticed by commentators on the history of this period which I will venture to submit to their consideration, as the only means I can see of removing this remaining difficulty.

Darius never was king of Persia *in his own right*. Cambyzes died without posterity; his son Cyrus, the Cyrus of Scripture, who, in right of his mother

Mandane, had succeeded Ahasuerus, or Cyaxares II., as king of Media, having preceded his father to the grave, childless also. The sister and widow of Cambyzes, Atossa, was now the sole representative of the royal house of Cyrus I. Darius, as son-in-law of Cyaxares, was *elected* king of Media and Babylon. It was rather unhandsome of him to ascribe his personal elevation to his horse instead of to his wife. With the keen eye to his interest that won him the nickname of the "shop-keeper king," he laid the foundation of supreme power for his own house, by marrying the heiress Atossa. Still he was only king-consort, administrator for the true heir, his own son by Atossa. Xerxes would thus have ascended the throne of Persia in his own right, inheriting the supremacy over all Asia, even over his own father, at his mother's death, or his own majority. He therefore reigned over Persia many more years than the twenty-one years of the Babylonian canon, which are only the years of his reign at Babylon, as successor of Darius to the Median realm.

In this way, Ezra's special mission to Jerusalem, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, as bearer of costly gifts from the "king of kings" for the temple (vii. 12—20), would bear a date long prior to the death of Darius. It may, indeed, coincide with the dedication of the temple. The father's decree had authorized his subjects to restore it: the son, presiding over the superior realm, sanctions his father's act by endowing it. The longevity of Ezra and Nehemiah need not then be stretched to any unreasonable bounds to shew them both still active and zealous in the discharge of their duties at the restoration and dedication of the wall of Jerusalem, soon after the twentieth year of the same Artaxerxes, as this might fall almost immediately after the death of Darius.

Hammersmith.

FANNY CORBAUX.

The name "Elohim."—There has been lately a good deal of controversy on this subject in the *Jewish Chronicle*, and from the correspondence we select the following, which will give a favourable idea of modern Jewish criticism.

To the Editor of the "Jewish Chronicle."

33 Cumberland-street, Edinburgh. Nov. 17, 5618.

SIR,—The controversy now pending in your valuable journal on "Elohim," induces me to address to you a few remarks.

It will be observed in the sacred volume that among the various names of God, such as *אלהים*, *אלה*, *אל*, by which he is designated by the Hebrews, the name *אלהים* was the one mostly used, and seems to have been the one most familiar to them.

It is worthy of remark, that with the exception of *אלי*, my God, none of the first mentioned three names will be found to admit of the suffixes except *אלהים*—a circumstance which in itself speaks for the familiarity of this name.

After the redemption of the Israelites from Egypt, the land of gross polytheism, the divine lawgiver endeavoured to implant into the bosom of every Israelite the sublime idea of monotheism. In order to remove every obstacle in the way; in order to prevent the possibility of error as to the true and only definition of the familiar name *אלהים*, which has the plural form, Moses sought to represent it to them as a singular noun in a plural form, *i. e.*, so as to exclude every notion of polytheism, and to become synonymous with *אלה*, *אל*, etc.

The divine lawgiver accordingly proclaimed the exalted doctrine of monotheism in the following very striking words:—"Know thou, Israel, that *אלהים* is our *אלהים* (and) *אלהים* is one!" He unceasingly called the attention of the Israelites to this doctrine, and exhorted them to reflect on this most important point. He repeated the same on another occasion, and recommended to them to meditate on the truth of monotheism, in order to convince themselves that by the name of Elohim nothing is to be conceived but the only Jehovah. Thus in Deut. iv. 39, "Understand this day, and reflect in thy mind, that Jehovah is the Elohim, . . . there is no more, *אלהים*."

In the days of Ahab, king of Israel, when the people were undecided as to the signification of Elohim, as is recorded in 1 Kings xviii. 21, "How long halt

ye between two opinions, whether Jehovah is Elohim," they were doubtful whether the name of Elohim, was to be considered synonymous with Jehovah as taught by Moses, or was to be applied to polytheism, viz., the *גלילים*. It was then that Elijah, a second Moses, inspired by God, addressed his prayer to God as follows:—"Answer me, Jehovah, answer me. Let this people be convinced that thou Jehovah art the Elohim." God accordingly accepted his prayers. The people perceived the miracles performed by the prophet, and unitedly they fell on their knees, making the all-important confession—"Jehovah is the Elohim, Jehovah is the Elohim!" In the same spirit the Psalmist chanted, "Acknowledge that Jehovah is Elohim."—Ps. c. 3.

Indeed, the name Elohim is to be met with in the Bible as a singular in its meaning, though in a plural form, and is always synonymous with *יהוה יאלה יאל*; for instance *יהוה הוא ידע יאל יאלהים ידעו הוא ידע ידעו*—Josh. xxii. 22. These names are only an emphatical repetition of the appellations of one and the same Being, similar to the repetition of the name Jehovah in *יהוה יהוה יאל*—Exod. xxxiv. 6, agreeably to the idiom of the Hebrew tongue.

In like manner the name Elohim is found in numerous cases associated with that of Jehovah as a mere repetition of the latter. A proof in favour of our opinion, viz., that Elohim, Eloha and El are all synonymous with one another, will be afforded when we observe in the Scriptures that the very identical expressions are sometimes accompanied by Eloha and sometimes Elohim, such as *יהוה אלהים* and *יהוה אלה*, and the like.

Having thus far shewn that, owing to the deeply rooted idea of monotheism, the name of Elohim was always understood by the Hebrews as a singular noun, it consequently cannot be considered erroneous, if, whenever this name was to be used as a title, they applied it even to one individual; hence the phrase, *נחתיך אלהים למצוה*, "I have appointed thee as a superior to Pharaoh."—Exod. vii. 1.

From what has been said it may be inferred that Elohim perfectly and regularly harmonizes with singular verbs, as very frequently found in the Bible. But, like all linguistic anomalies, Elohim is also found sometimes accompanied by plural verbs. The few exceptions to the latter case cannot be accounted for on any satisfactory ground. As a proof thereof, we find several phrases in the Bible in which the very verbs, adjectives, or pronouns accompanying the name Elohim, are found in the one case in a singular, and in the other in a plural form.

Examples:—*אלה אלהך ישראל אשר העלך*—Exod. xxxii. 4; and *יהוה אלהך אשר העלך*—Neh. ix. 18; likewise *אלהים שופט שופטים* and *אלהים*; or, *אלהים ודום* and *אלהים*.

Among the exceptions wherein Elohim is accompanied by a plural verb, must also be ranked the passage (Gen. i. 26) *נעשה אדם בצלמנו*; but in the very next verse *אלהים* is already in the singular,—*ברא אלהים את האדם בצלמו*.

It is remarkable that many phrases containing the word Elohim, as uttered by pagans, have the verb always in plural, whilst when the very phrases are used by a Hebrew, the same verb is used in the singular—a proof in favour of what has been said above, namely, that the Hebrews at all times attached to Elohim no other signification save that of indivisible oneness.

Examples:—*כה יעשן לי אלהים וכה יוספו*—I Kings xx. 10, spoken by the King of Aram; *כה יעשן אלהים וכה יוספו*—Ibid. xix. 2, spoken by Jesabel, wife of Ahab; *כה יעשה לך אלהים וכו'*—1 Samuel iii. 4; *ibid.* xx. 13, spoken by Hebrews.

Numerous other instances might here be recorded, but those given are deemed sufficient.

At the same time I may be allowed to reply to your correspondent, Mr. Bernstein, who cites the Derasha of R. Simlai in the words of the Jerusalemic Talmud—(?) *וכי דרשה אמנה היא* Is the Derasha to be believed?—Nasir vii. It is, alas, very often the case that conversionists employ some of those unimportant Drashoth, or doctrines like those of R. Moshe de Lion's *החור' ס'* and others, in order to stagger the unlearned Jewish believer.

I am, dear Sir, your obedient servant,
HENRY VIDAVER.

The Six Days of Creation.—If Moses had in his thoughts such unmeasured periods or cycles of time, why did he use the terms *evening* and *morning* and *day* to mark the several stages of the work? The answer is because *day* is the best term that any ancient tongue could furnish; any other word for a rounded portion of time, however large or small, being ultimately resolvable into the same radical idea. Moreover, each period had two contrasted parts which could not be so well expressed in any way as by those images which in all the early tongues enter into the terms for evening and morning. In short, the several successive natures were so many worlds or æons of time, vast chronological circles. And the earlier part of each period is in turn spoken of as an evening, because it was the waning or passing off of an old nature; or the latter part of each is called a morning, because it was the dawning or day-break of a higher nature. There was a rolling out of one world-growth, and a rolling in of another; and the old age of the one and the youth of the other, taken together, make up one of the creative periods. Hence the very peculiar and remarkable language of the account, which is properly rendered thus: "And there was an evening, and there was a morning; one day." And again: "And there was an evening, and there was a morning; the second day." And so on through the whole series.

Nor can this view be justly faulted as devised to meet a special exigency of science. It is forced upon us by matters lying on the very face of the record; especially in respect of the first four periods. By representing them as ante-solar, the writer clearly intimates that the days he is speaking of were not the common circles of time marked by the rising and setting of the heavenly bodies. The days were anomalous. The first evening was utterly indefinite; the first morning unlike any at least that is now made by the sun. Thus a *sufficient intimation* is given, that the days are to be understood in a manner consistent with the extraordinary acts. We have the idea of a period beginning in darkness and ending in light; a period measured on the one hand by chaos, and on the other by the birth of a higher system; and which is therefore called a day, as being analogous to the diurnal succession of darkness and light. Here, then, the easy and unforced interpretation is clearly on the side of the indefinite periods. No answer has yet been given that did not seem strained and far-fetched. And this view is greatly confirmed at the opening of the next chapter, where the whole time of creation, including all the six days in one full round of events, is also called a day: "These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth, *in the day* when the Lord God made the earth and the heavens." Of this great *day of days* it might also have been said there was an evening and a morning. It began when darkness was on the face of the waters; it ended in the morning of Paradise. In short, the days of the creation were God's days, the "days of eternity:" they were the evening and morning intervals of his creative ongoings, as much beyond our diurnal periods as his ways are above our ways, and his thoughts above our thoughts. Nor is it at all unlikely that these same days are referred to in the epistle to the Hebrews, where it is said, "Through faith we understand that the *worlds* were framed by the word of God;" where the original has *æons*, a term of vast duration being thus put for that which *endured*.

In connection with this point, Professor Lewis treats us to one of the most beautiful arguments in its kind that we have ever met with. We shall endeavour to reproduce it in the fewest and clearest words possible.

The idea of a day, in its most general sense, has four constituents. 1st. Its periodic nature. 2nd. This periodicity made up of two antithetic states having opposite qualities, so that each is the negation of the other. 3rd. Its duration in time. 4th. The mode of marking its duration, and of determining its periodicity. Of these the first two are generic and constant; the last two variable and specific. Without the periodicity and the antithetic division, there could not be a day at all; the idea would be lost: no mere continuous length of time arbitrarily measured would answer to the notion. On the other hand, the last two constituents may be varied to almost any extent, and yet the radical idea be preserved. The duration may be twenty-four hours, or twenty-four thousand years. The antithetic division may be by risings and settings of the

sun ; or by any cyclical law of nature producing two opposite times of rest and action, of cold and warmth, of decay and growth ; or by any other mode that should give us two seasons of direct contrast, and making up, together, the full cycle.

Applied, then, to the common solar day, these four constituents would stand thus: 1st. The periodic nature. 2nd. The two antithetic seasons. 3rd. A specific duration of twenty-four hours. 4th. The duration and antithetic division marked by the rising and the setting of the sun. Here the last two have a peculiar character belonging specially to what we call a solar day. Is it urged that such are the days of creation? that the third constituent is as invariable in the idea as the first two; that this analysis *assumes* fixedness in the first two, and variableness in the others? and that twenty-four hours, or that precise length of time, is as essential to the idea of what we call a day, as its periodic nature; so that there can be no day without it? Then the answer is, why is not the fourth, or the present way of making and of marking that duration by sun-risings and sun-settings, equally essential and invariable? Which inheres most fixedly in the idea of a common day, its duration of twenty-four hours, or its divided portions of sunrise and sunset? Do we not truly feel that it is easier to sever from the idea the former than the latter? We can more easily think of a day longer than twenty-four hours, than one having no sun-made antithetic division. But, we are forced to make this severance in the case of the Mosaic days, at least the first four of them. They were certainly without a rising and setting of the sun. If, without this, they could be called days, much more could the name be given to such as varied from the common day in respect of the less essential point of a twenty-four hours' duration. As, then, they were not *common* days in this respect, what violation is there of language or of ideas in taking the further step, and affirming them to be uncommon in respect of duration? And this becomes much easier, if we take our stand-point in those early times when the images contained in the Hebrew words for evening and morning, and so naturally associated with the general idea of periodicity, were yet fresh in men's thoughts. Since they have faded out, the conception assumes a more abstract and merely quantitative character, and we grow rigid in thinking of a certain duration as the most essential part of the idea. When the Hebrew words for evening and morning were as freshly metaphorical as our *fall* and *spring*, and contained much the same images, of repose and reviviscence, it was much easier to keep up the association of ideas on which the right interpretation so much depends.

Now, nothing is more certain than that the Hebrew *yom* or *day* occurs oftenest in the unmeasured sense of *age*; as in the following: "In that *day*, saith the Lord, I will gather in the outcasts, and the Lord himself shall reign over them." "In that *day* shall ye say, I will praise the Lord, for he has become our salvation." In the latter *days* shall the Lord's house be established on the tops of the mountains." "Whose outgoings are from the *days* of eternity." "His throne shall be as the *days* of heaven." Now, if in these and all similar passages the Hebrew *yom* had been rendered *age* in our version, we should have grown familiar with the phrase, and so been prepared for the same sense in the first of the Genesis. In respect of the idea, we should have been in the same condition as the early Hebrew mind when it was familiar with both uses of the term, and took each as alike natural, seeing no more of metaphor in the one usage than in the other. We might even have felt that the larger sense was also the more primitive and real; and, in fact, the original idea, in respect to which all the lesser applications are but cyclical correspondences on a reduced scale.

So, too, in the words for *evening* and *morning*. The Bible often uses them in a like indefinite sense. And in many other tongues, *evening* is used for a time of decline or repose, and *morning* for the coming in of something higher and better. We speak of the *morning* of the year: the spring is so called as its season of reviving, just as the winter is its *evening* of torpor or repose. So, too, we have the morning and evening of life, of a nation's history, of the world, of the human race. Nor is this usage any more poetical than that of our words

spring and *fall* for the seasons of the dying and reviving year. Our solar diurnal period ceases at the Arctic circle. And we speak of the day at the pole as being twelvemonths in duration, with six months of darkness for its evening, and six of light for its morning. There the day is identical with the year: still it is a day; and we feel that the language is strictly true, and not merely a metaphorical application. Were we as familiar with the use of *evening* and *morning*, as we are with that of *fall* and *spring*, for certain portions of the year, we should then much more readily enter into the sense of the same terms as used for those longer antithetic times of rest and awakening which make up the Mosiac *yom* or period. The Hebrews *were* familiar with such an usage; so that we are on strong ground when we maintain that in the reading of Genesis the larger cyclical ideas would come as naturally to them as the smaller do to us.

The interpretation of the Mosaic days is by no means a modern discovery. It is as old at least as the time of the great St. Augustine. Our author shews conclusively that this wisest of the Christian fathers was led, without any hints from geology, but by the very style and language of the record itself, to regard the creative days as altogether extraordinary and anomalous in their character. Thus in one place he speaks of the Mosaic evening and morning as distinguishing between a nature not yet made and its subsequent manifestation. And, again, he says that this evening and morning are to be regarded not so much in respect of duration as of their making the boundaries of a periodic nature. In another place, where he has been treating of the Sabbath, he says that "this day is not to be understood as those made by the circuit of the sun, but in another manner, not unlike that which marked the first three days of creation." And the context shews that he was not merely endeavouring to account for the three ante-solar days, but that he viewed the whole seven as of the same strange character. "For," says he, "the same mode is carried through, not merely to the fourth, leaving the others to be regarded as common solar days, but even to the sixth and seventh; so that, throughout, the day and night, between which God divided, are to be understood far otherwise than that other day and night, of which he said, let the luminaries divide them; for this latter kind he then established when he ordained the sun." Our author quotes much more from this great Doctor, to the like effect. Thus, in one place, he says, "Of what kind these days were, it is very difficult, yea, impossible, for us even to think, much more, to speak."

The most plausible objection to this view of indefinite periods comes from the mention of the Sabbath. The argument runs thus: If the seventh was a common day of twenty-four hours, so must have been the other six; but that the seventh was such a day we know, because it was made the beginning and rule of reckoning for our Sabbaths appointed in memory of the divine observance. Now, it is clear enough, that if the seventh was a common day, so were all the rest. But we may invert the argument. On the seventh day God rested from the work of creation: have we heard of his resuming that work? Was, then, his Sabbath, or rest, a day of twenty-four hours? Did it have, has it had, an evening and a morning, like the others? Has it yet come to an end? If not, then we turn the argument thus: the seventh was, or rather is, a long, unmeasured period; and therefore the others were of the same kind. And, to one who looks at the matter from the right point of view, there is great fitness and beauty in the less being thus used as a memorial of the greater; the weekly Sabbath made by the sun thus symbolizing, and ever calling to mind, the great Sabbath, or rest of God, which, as far as regards the physical world, still continues.

But here, again, St. Augustine remarks that in each of the first six days there is the same constant mention of an evening and morning; but that in the seventh this is omitted. The circumstances of the case forbid us to regard such omission as unmeaning. And many other old writers were struck with this change touching the seventh day. There must be some sense in which God's Sabbath is not finished. The difficulty vanishes at once, if we put out of view the notion of common days, and get free of the impediments growing from so narrow an interpretation. What other reason could there be for the forecited change, than that the seventh period had not yet closed? Its morning had not

even arrived. We are still in the evening of God's Sabbath, unless Christ's ascension were its closing era. What the morning of that Sabbath may be, we must learn from Scripture, or not at all; and Scripture speaks of "the morning of the resurrection."

The objection drawn from the fourth commandment is the more untenable, forasmuch as it overlooks an answer that is legible on the very face of the language. The literal rendering is something thus: "Six day shalt thou labour and *do all thy work*. For six days God *wrought* the heavens and the earth." There is the same word of *working* in both cases. Now, who will say that God's work and man's, or his manner of working and man's, are the same, or to be taken in any aspects of mere likeness, because *the same term is used of both*, or of the common idea that unites them? If we attend to the *proportion* of the thing, we may find it thus: six earthly days shalt thou labour and do thy human work; for in six heavenly days, or "days of eternity," God did his divine work in the creation of the world. What other idea than this can any sound reason take, on finding the same words applied to the works of man, and to the ineffably higher works of God? Again, the literal rendering would be, "Remember the day of rest, for God rested on the day of rest." The same word for Sabbath in both cases: but is the meaning identical? Is there no transition to the higher idea? Is God's rest our rest? Are not "his ways higher than our ways, and his thoughts than our thoughts, even as the heavens are higher than the earth?"

On this subject we find a very noble and striking passage in Hugh Miller's *Foot Prints of the Creator*, which it may be well to quote. "Man," says he, "when in his unfallen state, bore the image of God; but it must have been a miniature image at best: the proportion of man's week to that of his Maker may, for aught that appears, be mathematically just, and yet be a miniature image, too—the mere scale of a map, on which inches represent geographical degrees. All those week days and Sabbath days of man which have come and gone since man first entered upon this scene of being, with all which shall yet come and go, until the resurrection of the dead terminates the work of redemption, may be included, and probably *are* included in the one Sabbath day of God."—*American Church Monthly*.

Jewish Sepulchral Monuments.—The Jewish congregation at Prague is undoubtedly one of the most ancient in Europe. Some historians go so far as to assert that Bohemia was inhabited by Jews even before the conversion of her pagan population to Christianity. Be this as it may, it is admitted on all hands that the congregation settled in the capital dates from a very remote antiquity, although, owing to repeated expulsions, inundations, and conflagrations, no very ancient records are preserved in the communal archives. It was especially the terrible conflagration of 1689, consuming the whole Jewish quarter, which destroyed all annals. The only undeniable evidence of a most remote antiquity that still remains, is the old Jewish burial-ground, situated in the midst of what formerly was called the Jndenstadt, a gloomy, dismal looking portion of the city, in its lowest part, on the right bank of the Moldau, and exposed to the almost annually recurring overflowings of a river every spring swollen by its numerous tributary mountain torrents. Few visitors of this picturesque and historically remarkable city fail to inspect the extraordinary relic formed by the burial-ground. Let us imagine, in order to form a conception of it, a plot of ground as irregular in shape as Smithfield, although much larger, surrounded on all sides by high dead walls, lofty synagogues, and dreary buildings, one side of which forms a partition separating the dead within from the living beyond, the surface of which plot is, in many places, artificially raised nearly to the level of the wall, in consequence of the necessity under which, as we presume, the communal authorities found themselves from time to time to cover with earth the old graves in order to gain space for the new ones. Let us imagine the place thickly overgrown with rank vegetation, from which peer forth, apparently in a mass of inextricable confusion, thousands of tomb-stones and sepulchral monuments, from the simplest form, represented by a rough piece of wood, to the

most artistic group, from the commonest dull grey stone to the costliest glossy marble, in all stages of preservation and decay, and in various angles of inclination, some rising above the high grass and bushes, others half sunk into the ground from their own weight, whilst the very tops of others are just on the point of diving into the yawning depth; and these monuments of mortality are covered over with emblems and Hebrew inscriptions from the top to the bottom, and often also on all sides, some of the epitaphs being faint and worn by the hand of time, and moss grown, whilst others challenge the eye of the passer by the boldness of the character, and the glistening black paint overlaying the cavities of the engraved letters. Now it is this venerable burial-ground which constitutes the most truthful witness of the antiquity of the Jewish settlement at Prague. It is the dead who bear testimony to the living. Yet no one hitherto properly undertook to interrogate this witness, or, if the task were undertaken, to publish the evidence. To the learned, zealous, and liberal-minded M. Albert Cohen the merit is due of having enabled Herr Lieben, actuary of the burial society, by defraying the expense of publication, to send forth to the world a most interesting little volume, containing a collection of 170 of the most important epitaphs, copied from the tomb-stones, reaching from the year 941 to 1787, when the burial-ground was closed by order of the then emperor, Joseph II. These epitaphs form, as far as they extend, as it were, the history—at least they supply the most valuable materials for the history—of a congregation which, in the mental development of European Judaism down to our own time, has acted a very conspicuous part.

The perusal of the epitaphs is not only instructive but also calculated to fill the heart with feelings of the deepest melancholy. Occasionally the eye is met in the inscriptions by the term *חורין*, literally the saint, but really meaning the martyr; that is, one murdered by fanatics because he refused to change his religion. An epitaph of this kind is the following, which we translate from the Hebrew, in which, however, the word martyr does not occur:—

“Here lies interred a faithful man, who was slain: his name is Abram, son of Jacob. The Name (God) will avenge his blood. His blood was shed like that of a bullock. Twelfth of Iyar, 236, of the abridged era. (פ עב).”

Here is another, of which we offer only an abridgment, it being too long for translation in full:—

“Here is interred the martyr, the high priest our master, the exalted Rabbi Chaim, the son of Isaac, the righteous priest. He was slain near the despicable city of Zwittan. He was a stately man, withal pious and humble, propagating the law in an academy. The God of vengeance will take revenge, and may his death expiate all guilt.”

Here is another more pathetic, with which we shall close our martyrological extracts:—

“Here lie interred the ashes of the martyrs, Israel, son of Isaiah, Hurwitz, the Levite, and of his father-in-law, Rabbi Moses, son of Joel, who have delivered over their lives to the flames, and in public have sanctified the name of God; that their bodies should be pure without guilt, was the silent resolution of both of them. Loudly they recited: ‘Hear, O Israel, the Eternal our God, the Eternal is one.’ Their desire was that their souls should quit them at the same time. They were not guilty of any transgression against the Law of Moses. The splendour of Israel was consigned to the land of darkness, and Moses stepped nigh the dark cloud on the sixth day of the week, Kislev 27, in the year 329 of the abridged era.”

Epitaphs of two of the most remarkable men that ever adorned a congregation are those of Mordechai Meisel and David Oppenheim. That of the former is too long and too tautological for being reproduced in full. We will, therefore, select those portions for translation which allude to the charities of this good man:—

“His favours extended over us all, his benefactions were bestowed upon everybody. He built a little sanctuary, dedicating it to the Eternal, a splendid edifice. He erected hospitals and bathing-houses. He paved the Jewish quarter, bought the ground for a burial-place, appointed a house for a meeting-place for

scholars, was very generous to those who studied the law, gave marriage portions to poor maidens, and ample charity to the needy, and exerted himself in redeeming prisoners according to his ample means. His whole generation received advice and support from him, he assisted them in the hour of distress, deeply sympathised with their troubles, lent 20,000 dollars, without interest, to the congregations of Posen and Cracow. He stood high in the esteem of princes and his monarch. In his days there were no calamities in our quarter, for he protected us with all his might. He died at the age of 73, and was buried with great honour."

To this epitaph the learned annotator, Herr Simon Hock appends, in the same publication, the following biographical sketch:—

"Mordechai, son of Samuel Meisel, was born in 1528, probably at Prague, since this family name is already met with in 1477, and became not extinct with him, although he died childless. In his younger days he witnessed the two eventful expulsions of the Jews from Prague, respectively 1542 and 1561. However, in the following year they obtained permission to return, after which time Meisel appears to have attained to riches and influence. His name is first mentioned in 1569. He was twice married. His second wife survived him."

His public charities are thus summed up by the annotator:—

"He built the High Synagogue, presented rich gold and silver adornments, and costly embroidery, not only to the synagogues of Prague, but also to those at Jerusalem and in Poland; he erected a general bathing-house, and also one solely for the use of women, built a poor-house, paved the whole Jewish quarter, often clothed the poor of the whole congregation, gave regularly every year their marriage portions to two deserving young women, lent considerable sums of money, without interest, to tradespeople, in order to assist them in business. To the congregations of Posen and Cracow, which, in 1590, had been reduced by fires to great misery, he partly lent and partly presented 20,000 dollars. In 1590 he bought a piece of ground, and erected upon it a synagogue, called to this day by his name, Meisel Schule, which could not have cost him less than 10,000 dollars. He also established an academy, and bought the ground for a burial-place. All these public institutions were founded at his sole expense. In 1581 he contributed 100 rix-dollars towards the rebuilding of the Salvador Church. In 1593 he was elected senior warden of his congregation; he was highly esteemed at court, and some historians report that he was aulic counsellor, and entrusted with the imperial seal. He died in the night, between the 13th and 14th of March, 1601, having twelve days previously made his will in the presence of the Chief Rabbi Lowe, son of Bezalel, and his two brother wardens, and having amply provided for all the members of his family by liberal bequests, appointed his two nephews as his heirs. His burial was attended by the highest state officer, the emperor himself sending a representative. His will, however, was not recognized by the government, the crown claiming the property of the deceased, since he had died childless. It is said that not less than 600,000 marcs silver were found in his house in cash, and numerous lawsuits ensued among the legatees and against the crown, which ninety years after his death had not yet terminated."

The next epitaph attracting our attention is that of Rabbi David Oppenheim, who was as successful in accumulating literary treasures as Meisel had been in gathering those of a material nature. The life of this celebrated chief rabbi deserves a special notice in these pages, since his famous Hebrew library now enriches our own Bodleian. We will not copy his very long epitaph, which chiefly eulogizes his great learning, piety, efforts for the promotion of study, and expatiates on the merits of the work composed by him, but make some few extracts from the learned annotator quoted before:—

"David, son of Abraham Oppenheim, was born at Worms in 1664. He was a nephew of the Viennese court agent, Samuel Oppenheim, and a disciple of Gerson Oulif Ashkenasi, Rabbi of Metz; in 1686 he was Chief Rabbi at Brecz, in Lithuania; in 1690 Chief Rabbi of Moravia; and in 1702 Chief Rabbi of Prague, and head of the academies. In 1713 he was elected Chief Rabbi over half, and in 1718 over the whole of Bohemia, and confirmed in his office by the

successive emperors, Leopold I., Joseph I., and Charles II. He died in 1736. Although a great scholar, author of several valuable works, and most benevolent and liberal, yet was he chiefly remarkable for his extraordinary love for books. He collected, at an immense expense, and through extraordinary exertions, a Hebrew library, such as was not equalled either before or after his time. He had agents in all quarters of the globe, commissioned to buy for him valuable Hebrew works, whether printed or in manuscript. It contained not less than 1000 manuscripts. Rabbi Oppenheim must have been a very rich man, since the tithe which he gave to the poor is stated in his epitaph to have amounted to 50,000 dollars. In the controversy against the followers of Sabbathia Zeebe, which raged in his time, he evinced most tolerant sentiments, and steadfastly refused to join in the excommunication hurled by the rabbis of the age against this sect. He was considered as a good mathematician. Several works of his have been published, many more, however, are still in manuscript, twenty-four of which are in the possession of one private individual at Viasen, near Wilna."

Among the 170 epitaphs are also a considerable number of remarkable women. We will copy one or two. The first is that of Hendel, wife of the senior warden of the congregation at Prague:—

"Jacob Baschevi, a man who for munificence, charity, true piety, and zeal for his brethren, has but few equals. Highly esteemed by the successive emperors, his cotemporaries, knighted by them, with the title Von Truenberg, and distinguished with extraordinary immunities and privileges for the uncommon services rendered to the state in times of great peril, his noble-minded wife rivalled him in deeds of charity and philanthropy. Having died in 1628, she for ten years witnessed the ravages of the war which desolated Germany for thirty consecutive years. During this calamitous period she proved a real mother to the distressed. At her table she fed the hungry, the naked her hands clothed, the orphans she educated, for poor girls she provided, needy scholars she supported, synagogues and schools she supplied with the necessary means. Whenever, in the neighbouring countries, the pillaging soldiers had destroyed books necessary for instruction or edification, she forwarded fresh supplies. She died deeply lamented by the thousands whom she befriended and benefitted."

Vögele, wife of Rabbi Isaac, the priest (she died in the year 1629), is, in the epitaph, greatly extolled, not only for her charity and piety, but also for her learning, she being a Talmudic scholar.

Let our readers not suppose that with these extracts we have exhausted the interest of the publication. Far from it, since every page records remarkable facts and notices, from which we have just culled a few as specimens. What renders the publication still more valuable is its introduction, written by Rappaport, replete, as are all the productions of this great scholar, with learning, deep research and profound criticism. Our review has already grown so extensive that we cannot spare any room for extracts from the introduction. But we can promise those interested in Hebrew literature and the history of the Jews, who will peruse it, a rich treat, such as can only be prepared by the genius and acumen of the erudite and indefatigable Chief Rabbi of the capital of Bohemia.—*From a Review of Lieben's "Inscriptions in the Old Cemetery at Prague," in Jewish Chronicle.*

Present State of Jerusalem.—"Our dwellings, dear enough, would in Europe resemble hovels or dungeons. They are low, narrow, damp vaults, with walls hardly whitewashed, and which will hold neither nail nor hook. Small hand-stoves serve to bake the scanty dough. The whole week we live upon pulse, eggs, milk food, melons, or cucumbers. There is no meat except mutton or fowl. The majority cannot afford to buy meat except on Passover and New-year. Corn is bought every week, and has to be cleaned, sifted, carried to the mill, be brought home, converted into dough, and carried to the oven. This is a task which occupies the housewife and her daughters three full days out of every week, and which proves a great obstacle to the establishment of a school. The dress is oriental, picturesque and noble, even in tatters. Clear eyes and light hair are a rarity among the Jerusalemites. . . The Jewish population is

about 7000 souls, which may be divided into two classes. Two-thirds are orientals, heirs to all the patriarchal virtues, almost entirely devoted to sacred studies. Few women, however, can read; they recite their prayers from memory. They are averse to every innovation, and afraid of European influence. The other third consists of Poles and Russians, who arrive by every steamer. These are divided into five or six congregations, by no means friendly with each other. There is also a German congregation of about twenty families who have a desire for schools and progress, but they are in a decided minority. Among these are distinguished Herr Schwarz, author of the book *Palestine*, and Herr Hausdorf, dragoman of the Austrian consulate. There are also five or six French and Italian families, who, however, do not count *מן*, and therefore have to join the other congregations. The Poles import, together with their trailing caftans and fur caps—now banished from the states of the czar—all the peculiarities now characterizing them. There are among them great scholars, but the mass is blindly fanatic and bitterly opposed to every study. Perhaps the wrongs suffered by them in Europe render them hostile to everything proceeding from thence. However, since the repeated journeys of the Montefiores, Rothschilds, and Cohens to the Holy Land, and the highly meritorious efforts made by them for her welfare, the terror with which the European costume was regarded is diminishing. The resident Jews begin to comprehend that a Jewish heart, loving God and observing his law, may also beat under a *gilet*.

* * * * *

The only relic remaining to us of the glorious temple is the so-called *חומה המערבית* (Western Wall). It is a wall of about fifty arms' length, consisting of massive oblong stones. The first layer, on a level with the space paved at the expense of Sir Moses Montefiore, where every Friday the devout assemble in hundreds in order to perform there the evening service and recite Psalms, consists of hard, imperishable stones, each the length of two arms, and one and a half high. After six or eight layers both the stones as well as their cut change; they are about 2000 years old. The upper stones are small and square, of about half an arm's length, similar to those used in constructing the high wall and strong towers surrounding the city, of which Saladin was the builder.—*From the Journal of a lady printed in the "Educatore Israelita."*

Christian Art.—Dean of St. Paul's.—Supposing it were possible to concentrate in one great museum the whole of these things, where should you prefer to draw the line? Would you draw the line between what I may call the ancient Pagan world and the modern Christian world, and so leave, to what may be called the ancient world, all the ancient sculpture, and any fragments of ancient painting which there might be—all the vases, all the ancient bronzes, and, in short, everything which comes down to a certain period? Do you think that that would be the best division, or should you prefer any division which takes special arts, and keeps those arts together?—I should like the Pagan and Christian division. I think it very essential that wherever the sculpture of a nation was, there its iron work should be—that wherever its iron work was, there its pottery should be, and so on.

And you would keep the mediæval works together, in whatever form those mediæval works existed?—Yes; I should not at all feel injured by having to take a cab-drive from one century to another century.

Or from the ancient to the modern world?—No.

Mr. Richmond.—If it were found convenient to keep separate the Pagan and the Christian art, with which would you associate the mediæval?—By "Christian and Pagan Art" I mean, before Christ, and after Christ.

Then the mediæval would come with the paintings?—Yes: and also the Mahomedan, and all the Pagan art which was after Christ, I should associate as part, and a most essential part, because it seems to me that the history of Christianity is complicated perpetually with that which Christianity was effecting. Therefore, it is a matter of date, not of Christianity. Everything before Christ I should be glad to see separated, or you may take any other date that you like.

But the inspiration of the two schools—the Pagan and the Christian—seems so different, that there would be no great violence done to the true theory of a national gallery in dividing those two, would there, if each were made complete in itself?—That is to say, taking the spirit of the world after Christianity was in it, and the spirit of the world before Christianity was in it.

Dean of St. Paul's.—The birth of Christ, you say, is the commencement of Christian art?—Yes!

Then Christian influence began, and, of course, that would leave a small debateable ground, particularly among the ivories, for instance, which we must settle according to circumstances?—Wide of any debateable ground; all the art of a nation which had never heard of Christianity, the Hindoo art and so on, would, I suppose, if of the Christian era, go into the Christian gallery.—*National Gallery Commission.*

The Cozri of Rabbi Yehudah Halleli.—By Rev. Dr. Adolph Fischel, of New York.—Among the distinguished rabbins, who, by their writings, piety, and religious zeal, have rendered themselves worthy of the respect and affection of all true Israelites, a prominent place may well be claimed for Rabbi Yehudah Halleli. He was one of the few on whom Providence had bestowed the talents both of a poet and a philosopher. Endowed with a vivid imagination, a warm heart and strong religious sympathies, he poured forth in melodious strains his gratitude to his God, and in soul-stirring elegies lamented the fate of Israel and Jerusalem. On these poetic effusions the highest honour has been conferred by his brethren, who inserted them in their ritual and recite them on fasts and festivals. Distinguished as he was as a poet, he allowed not his imagination to overshadow his reason; for, as his book *Cozri* shews, he was a profound thinker and devoted to the study of philosophy. This work, written in the year 4900 A.M. (1140 C.E.), was translated by Yehudah Ibn Tibbon from the original Arabic into Hebrew, and re-translated into Latin, Spanish, and German.

The book is written in the form of a dialogue, and the author no doubt chose this Socratic mode of argument as being the best and easiest plan for the exposition of his views and the refutation of objections. He chose as the basis of his dialogue an incident which transpired four centuries before his time. It seems that a king of the Chasars (whose dominions extended along the Caspian Sea) had a dream, in which an angel appeared to him and told him that "though his intentions were good, yet his acts were not acceptable to God." When he awoke he sent for a Greek philosopher, a Christian, and a Mahomedan, and asked each individually to give him a lucid exposition of their religious views. As none of these appeared satisfactory, he sent for a Hebrew and questioned him on various points connected with his religion and people. The Hebrew gave him an outline of the historical facts that form the basis of his belief, the ideas he entertains of a Supreme Being, which were not founded on speculative philosophy but on revelation, emanating from him who is the Creator and Guide of the universe, and who selected Israel from all nations to be his peculiar people, revealing to them the duties of man, the means whereby divine favour may be obtained, and everlasting life in a future world. The king listened attentively, argued each point with him, and finding his arguments conclusive embraced the Jewish faith, and appointed the Hebrew as his teacher. The latter now gives a more systematic analysis of his doctrines, and begins by explaining the biblical expressions regarding the Deity. He then speaks of Palestine as the land of Israel, and of Israel in relation to the world, especially of their duties as true worshippers of God—duties which consist both in inward sentiments and outward observances. This leads him into a disquisition on the oral law and a refutation of the Karaite doctrines. The various names of God, as specified in the Bible, form the next subject of discussion, and also the attributes ascribed to him by Moses and the prophets. He further contrasts the doctrines of the Greek philosophers with those of the Holy Scriptures, and concludes with an exposition of his views on the human soul, free-will, Providence, and other metaphysical subjects.

The Hebrew then informed the king that he intended to depart on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. The king dissuaded him, and asked, "What he would do in the land of Canaan, seeing that the Shechina is no longer there? Why expose himself to all the dangers of a journey and a voyage?" But the Hebrew replied, "The Shechina that was seen eye to eye, is indeed no longer there, but the invisible spiritual Shechina is with every Israelite whose actions are correct, whose heart is pure, whose soul is zealous for the religion of the God of Israel. Heart and soul can only be pure and perfect in a place which we know is consecrated to the Lord; and hence the longing for the Holy Land, especially on the part of those who for former transgressions have to implore God's pardon. The dangers I may incur do not restrain me. Nay, far greater dangers might be incurred by him who longs and hopes for reconciliation with his God. This is more praiseworthy than to risk our lives in war to be called heroes and obtain honours." The king replied, "May God protect thee! he is the giver of all good, the God of mercy and reward. May he be gracious to thee, and to all who, like thyself, are devoted to him! Amen, Selah!" This latter part derives additional interest from the facts that Rabbi Yehudah Halleivi himself, animated with a strong desire to see the Holy Land, left Spain and its blue sky to visit the land of his forefathers. It is said that, when before the walls of Jerusalem, he recited his beautiful elegy on Zion, and there fell a victim to a murderous assault of an Arab. Whether this is true or not it is difficult to decide; and it has very appropriately been said of him what the Holy Scriptures say of Moses: "No man knoweth his sepulchre unto this day."

Those who have commented on the "Cozri" have invariably taken a somewhat contracted view of the author's object in writing this work. They speak of his exposition only in relation to his people and to his faith, but forget that the events of the times in which he lived may have furnished this occasion to produce such a work. The crusades which at that time agitated the Christian and Mahomedan world, and thus brought two cognate religious systems into collision, could not be looked on with indifference by the Hebrew. To him it was a collision of two erroneous principles, the vindication of which was left to the force of arms, and the prize of which was to be Jerusalem. How significant do not these words become in the mouth of the religious philosopher: "Great dangers might be incurred by him who longs and hopes for reconciliation with his God. This is more praiseworthy than to risk our lives in war, to be called heroes and obtain honours."—*Occident*.

Celtic Burial Places.—"Cairns, which are the most undisputed form of Celtic burial-place, were once very numerous in this district; but a great part must have been long since removed. The graves of Norway bear an outward resemblance to the Celtic cairn, but the main cause appears to be that in mountainous countries stones are more easily procurable than earth. Wherever a doubt, therefore, exists as to the proprietorship of one of these mounds, the only certain means of deciding would be afforded by an examination of the interior. The Norse cairn should enclose a stone chest or wooden chamber, and certainly iron weapons. Of all the cairns described in Hutchinson, not one can with certainty be identified as Norse. There is no mention of iron, a number only contained urns and ashes; and though unburnt bones and corpses have been found, the Norwegians, as has been observed before, burned the body, until at or about the time of their conversion to Christianity.

Tumuli or barrows still remain in great numbers. As far as any records have been kept of those removed, nearly all must be claimed for the Bronze age, and the main part of those yet standing are essentially of a Danish character. Again, in the description of this class of graves, we have no actual mention of iron antiquities. The cairn called Mill Hill appears to have been a Celtic burial-place, whilst Lowdon How was more probably Danish than Norse. Four different names are found in connexion with sepulchres of this kind; how, raise, barrow, and hill; but the distinction is principally that of age, and the order of the words as here placed indicates the period to which each belongs.

We have few traces of the Iron age, which is to be regarded as exclusively

Norwegian, wherever the body has been burned. On opening Beacon Hill, near Aspatria, an unusually long skeleton was found; but as some of the exhumed antiquities are described as effected by rust, it is possible that the grave was Norse of the latest period. Iron is said to have been found under two cairns, in the excavations at "Stoneraise Camp" in Dalston. Ormstead near Penrith was possibly a Norse burial-place, whilst Thulbarrow in the same neighbourhood (still remaining) is in all probability Danish. But there is no doubt an examination of the numerous tumuli yet scattered over the country would extend and correct our knowledge on this interesting subject. . . .

Runes are not to be found earlier than the Iron age, and in Cumbria they are still of later date. All those yet deciphered have proved to be Anglo-Saxon. On this part of our subject there is very little to be said, save that in doubtful cases every professor of runes imagines a different reading from every other, and where certainty prevails, the inscription invariably runs thus: "One person erected this to another," the name being rarely of the slightest importance.

Memorial stones of various kinds still remain in considerable numbers, the most remarkable of which perhaps is Nine Standards in Westmorland. Several villages called Unthank take their name from monuments no longer in existence, the word being in English *onthink*, and the phrase "to think on" still current in the dialect. *Bauta* stones are invariably found in connexion with graves.—*Sullivan's "Cumberland and Westmorland."*

Christian Jewish Sects in Russia.—Towards the close of the eighteenth century the so-called Jewish sect produced a great stir in the Russian church. Its origin is ascribed to a Jew named Zacharias, who is described as an astrologer and necromancer, and who came from Poland to Novgorod, about the year 1470. He began to teach secretly that the only divine law was that of Moses; that the Messiah was still to come; and that the worship of images was a sin. He made his first converts among clergymen and their families, who became so zealous in their new persuasion that they desired to receive circumcision. But Zacharias persuaded them not to discover by such an act their real sentiments, and to conform outwardly to the Christian religion. The clergymen strictly followed this prudent advice. The number of proselytes considerably increased, chiefly among the clergy, and some principal families of the town. These sectarians covered their real opinions with such a display of zeal in the rigid observance of the precepts of the church that they acquired a great reputation for sanctity. Two of them, Alexis and Dionysius, were accordingly transferred to Moscow, in 1480, by the grand duke, Ivan Vaalovich, as priests to two of the principal churches of the capital. Alexis advanced high in the favour of that monarch, to whom he had free access, which was a rare distinction. This circumstance gave him great facilities for propagating his opinions, and he made many proselytes; the principal of them were the secretary of the grand duke, Theodor Kuritzin, who was employed on several diplomatic missions, and Zosimus, the archimandrite of the convent of St. Simon, whom the grand duke, on the recommendation of the same Alexis, raised to the dignity of metropolitan of Moscow.

Alexis died in 1489, and it was only after his death that his opinions became known. The grand duke then declared that he remembered some very strange mysterious words of Alexis. It is also said that he confessed that his daughter-in-law, Helena, daughter of Stephen the Great, Prince of Wallachia, was seduced to the Jewish sect by a disciple of Alexis. The existence of this sect was discovered by Gennadius, Archbishop of Novgorod, who sent to Moscow several priests accused of having insulted the cross and the images of the saints, of having blasphemed against Christ and the Virgin, and denied the resurrection of the dead. A synod was assembled at Moscow; in 1490, in order to try these heretics. The metropolitan, Zosimus, presided, whose participation in their tenets was not then discovered. The accused denied the charge, but sufficient evidence was brought forward to prove the fact. The bishops wished to punish the heretics severely, but the grand duke opposed them, and declared they should only be anathematized and imprisoned. Theodor Kuritzin and other ad-

herents of the sect continued to propagate its doctrines, and to increase the number of its followers, particularly by teaching astrology. This began to spread a spirit of doubt and inquiry among many people; and clergymen and laymen were constantly disputing about the dogmas of religion. The sectarians were protected by the metropolitan Zosimus, who is accused of having persecuted the orthodox clergy.

The details about this sect are contained in a work by Joseph, hegumenos, or abbot, of the convent Volokolainsk, who died in 1516, and who was the most zealous adversary of this sect. Zosimus resigned his dignity in 1494, and retired into a convent. The persecution ceased for some time in Moscow, but the archbishop of Novgorod continued it in his district, whence many sectarians fled to Poland and Germany. In 1503 the representatives of the clergy, who were supported by this Joseph, induced the grand duke to issue an order for the trial of the heretics. They were tried before an ecclesiastical court, of which Joseph was a member, and the chief accuser. The heretics acknowledged their opinions, and maintained them to be true. They were condemned, and some of them publicly burnt, others had their tongues cut off, and many were shut up in prisons and convents. Nothing more has been heard of the sect since the date of 1503, but there now exists among the Roskolniks of Russia a sect which observes the Mosaic rites, and it is very probable that it is derived from the sect which we have described.

In several parts of Poland, Turkey, and in the Russian government of Tula, there are followers of Jelesnewsheheena. The origin of this appellation is unknown, and it is probably derived from the name of their founder, or some leading member. Although Russians by origin and language, they strictly observe the Mosaic law, perform circumcision, keep the Sabbath on Saturdays, and abuse the Christian religion. It may be that they are the descendants of that Jewish sect which appeared at Novgorod and Moscow at the close of the fifteenth century.—*Jewish Chronicle*.

Royal Society of Literature.—Nov. 25.—Mr. Hogg read a paper, "On the supposed Scriptural Names of Baalbec, the Syrian Heliopolis," in which he demonstrated that many names occurring in the Bible, which had been given to this celebrated place, had been attributed to it with little reason; and that it was impossible to shew, with any certainty, that it had any Biblical title at an early period of history. On the whole, Mr. Hogg considered the Bekathaven of Amos as the most likely of the names suggested.—Mr. Vaux read a paper, "On the recent Researches of C. T. Newton, Esq., Her Majesty's Vice-Consul at Mytilene, at Budrum (the ancient Halicarnassus)." Mr. Newton commenced his excavations in search of the mausoleum (or tomb of Mausolus, King of Caria), by digging on the spot marked as its site, by Captain Spratt, R.N., in the chart compiled by him for the English Admiralty. Here he found nothing which could be assigned to the mausoleum, though, in the neighbourhood, he came upon a mule's load, at least, of Greek and Roman terra-cottas, a large number of which have been shipped thence, and are now in England. Failing there, Mr. Newton determined to excavate on the spot suggested long since by Professor Donaldson, who, twenty-five years ago, observed fragments of Ionic columns lying about *in situ* and made drawings of many of them. Here he soon met with signal success in the discovery of the torso of an equestrian figure and of a seated female, both double the size of life, the hind-quarters of seven lions, the same in style as the heads still remaining in the castle—and two pieces of frieze, of great beauty—evidently parts of that already in the British Museum. Besides these more important objects, there was a vast collection of architectural fragments, which will be of great value to the student of architecture at home. There could be no doubt that he reached the structure of the mausoleum. A little later Mr. Newton found the Hellenic wall, which had once formed the north boundary of the *Temenos*, or precinct of the mausoleum, and, close to it, a colossal lion, quite perfect except his legs. Beyond this, again, was found a gigantic horse, with the bronze bit still remaining in his mouth, unquestionably one of the horses of the quadriga, which we know, from Pliny's description, was

at the top of the pyramid. It was now clear that the earthquake, which, in all probability, was the first to ruin the mausoleum, had thrown the quadriga and other portions of the sculptures beyond the northern boundary wall. Here, too, were subsequently found many blocks of marble, so cut as evidently to have formed the steps of the pyramid and part of the outer circle, the spokes and nave of the chariot-wheel, from which it may be inferred that the chariot itself was not less than twenty feet long. We are happy to be able to state that a large portion of the invaluable sculptures thus disinterred by Mr. Newton, have already, owing to the liberality of Government, safely reached the Museum, and that the remainder are on their way, and may be expected soon to arrive. Among the smaller objects which have reached England are fragments of a pale yellow vase in Oriental alabaster, bearing a Cuneiform inscription, and an Egyptian cartouche—each respectively recording the name of "Xerxes, the great King." Such vases are extremely rare, and only two or three are known bearing analogous inscriptions. Is it too much to conjecture that this very vase may have been a gift from Xerxes himself to the elder Artemisia, who, as we know from Herodotus, greatly distinguished herself, on his side, at the battle of Salamis?

Beirut, Syria, Sept. 26, 1857.—We are soon to have a weekly newspaper established in Beirut. It will be the first ever issued in Syria, and will be in the Arabic language, and supported and conducted entirely by natives. The house of Madowar, merchants of Beirut, are the chief pecuniary helpers of the enterprise, and Khalil Khevri Effendi, a young poet of the city, is to be the principal editor. We watch this enterprize with interest. It is a fair illustration of the cupidity and corruption of the Turkish officials that the firman authorizing this enterprize, so useful for the public good, could not be procured from Constantinople without a large outlay of piastres. I could wish that this Arabic journal might find a few patrons in England. The affairs of Syria move on much as usual. The country has been in rather an unquiet state this summer. Robberies and murders, and other outrages, have been of frequent occurrence in Lebanon, and the government does nothing but intrigue, as usual, and play their cards, and manage so as to keep things in some kind of order, and prevent downright rebellion. Just now they are beginning another conscription to recruit the army, and it will not be strange if there should be a storm on the mountains. The Druses will probably resist the conscription, as they did a few years since. A new element of trouble, this time, will be the enlistment of Christians in the army, which will have to be managed very carefully and favourably, or it will make mischief. No one can live long in Turkey without feeling that their security, and that of the people, is owing directly to the providential government of God, and the restraints he imposes on the passions of men; and not in any sense the result of the presence of the rulers. Yet there is no doubt that the mere name of a government is worth a great deal.—*Christian Times.*

The Sahara.—One M. C. Loyer, who writes from the Algerian Sahara, appears to think that in the Touaregs he has discovered a colony of ancient Jews or Christians. They are allied to the Berbers, and wear upon their bucklers, and the hilt of their swords, the emblem of the *Latin cross*. They hate the Arabs; and although nominally Mussulmans, they detest Mohammedanism. It is certainly strange that, while their relations of the Atlas, the Kabyles and the Mozabites, have lost their writings, the Touaregs have preserved theirs. More strange, the Arab has his sole law in the Koran, whereas the Kabyles, Mozabites, and the Touaregs *alone*, in the midst of African Mohammedans, possess, beside the Koran, a book of laws, a *civil code*, which, singularly enough, they call the *Canon (Kanoun)*. The celebrated Arabian writer, Ibn-Khaldoun, celebrates the Berbers and their cognates for their bravery, intelligence, hospitality, candour, and other excellent virtues. This writer says that they are Jews, but furnishes no proof. Besides making use of the Latin cross, the Touaregs have many usages in their religious assemblies which go far to shew that they are

the remains of a people Christianized in an imperfect manner at some very remote date. Further investigation may yield something more definite. The Berbers, their kindred, it is well known, always wear a veil over the countenance.—*Clerical Journal*.

Persian Jews.—There has lately been here the well known traveller, J. Benjamin, who is now making arrangements for a second journey to the East. He will go to Hamburg, and there embark for Malabar. The newspapers having reported the emancipation of the Jews in Persia, it may not be uninteresting to state that Herr Benjamin, on his return from his first journey, in 1856, in urgent terms memorialized the Emperor of the French, the Queen of England, and the Sultan, to intercede with the Shah for the Persian Jews, who live under the most awful oppression, and that it is not improbable that this representation has produced some effect.—*Frankfort Paper*.

Dr. Adam Clarke.—An obelisk is about to be erected to the memory of Dr. Adam Clarke, the Bible commentator, by J. J. Clarke, Esq., one of the members of Parliament for Londonderry, at Portrush, on ground given by the Earl of Antrim, the lord of the manor. Close to the site is a school founded by Dr. Clarke, the old schoolhouse still remaining, and well attended by the children of the neighbourhood. The connexion of the commentator with this part of the kingdom may not be generally known. He was born in 1762, of humble parentage, in a village in the north of Ireland. From early life he shewed a desire for entering the ministry, but the *res angusta domi* chilled his aspirations. At the age of eighteen he went to serve a Mr. Bennet, a linen-draper or merchant of Coleraine. This Mr. Bennet seems to have been an eccentric old bachelor or widower, and his household was as miscellaneous in its way as that of Dr. Johnson in Bolt-court. There was one ancient relation, or retainer, sheltered under the roof who was bedridden, and left to the charge of careless servants. Except to take her food, no one ever went near the poor old woman. Young Clarke commiserated her solitude; and his kind attention and pious consolation cheered the last days of the helpless sufferer. Another inmate of the house, Molly the cook, was a woman of boisterous manners and profane spirit, the terror of the whole establishment. To Adam Clarke she took a savage dislike, solely on account of his religious character. He tried to propitiate Molly, but the first attempts were repelled with a violence that forbade further experiments. The good man then tells that he then betook himself to pray for Molly, and the result was a turning of her heart and a change of her life, which amazed all Coleraine, and of which the tradition remains to this day. The author of "Mary Powell," in her "Memoirs of Good Servants," records the circumstance, remarking of Molly that "the tigress became a lamb. All her fierce and violent tempers were removed; she became meek and gentle, diligent in business, and fervent in spirit, serving the Lord." It was no sudden or superficial change that had come over her. Dr. Clarke left Coleraine soon after Molly was tamed; but thirty years after he revisited the place, and had the pleasure of enjoying Christian fellowship with his old and respected friend. These biographical gleanings are worth all the literary fame of Dr. Clarke, and the erection of a monument will help to perpetuate the memory of the good and learned man in the district where he commenced his labours of Christian usefulness.—*Athenæum*.

New Translation of the Bible.—We have been requested by the Very Rev. Dr. Husenbeth to give insertion to the following:—"Sir,—I observed a paragraph in your number for October 3rd last, page 954, in which you state correctly that Dr. Newman has been entrusted with the task of preparing a revised edition of the Catholic version of the Scriptures. But you proceed to say, that if you rightly apprehend the drift of the terms in which this statement is conveyed, it will be one part of his especial business to bring it as near as possible to the standard of the authorized version. I am anxious to assure you, as I am able to

do on the best authority, that Dr. Newman has no commission or intention to make the Protestant version a standard.

November 2, 1857.

T. C. HUSENBETH, D.D.

Trübner's Bibliotheca Glottica, I.—We are always delighted to announce the completion of any work connected with Bibliography or Philology. The former, as a commercial speculation, usually turns out a failure, and we are almost inclined to suspect that the indifference shewn by one or two of our leading literary Journals, in cavilling at some minor details of arrangement or plan, has in some way prevented a labour of love being more frequently turned to a great benefit. In truth, so little encouragement is given to those who, at their own proper cost, seek to benefit the world in this branch of literature, that we know of more than one work, most useful to many, which has been strangled in its birth, simply because some cold paragraph or acid criticism has misled the public entirely; and it is too much to expect that authors will give paper and print, to say nothing of their brains, without recompense. This work has been most carefully compiled by Hermann E. Ludewig, assisted by Professor Turner, whilst Mr. Trübner, the well-known Publisher, has, with a love of his subject, edited the whole, and, under his careful hand, a handsome, useful, and curious volume will find a place in many libraries. The first portion (complete in itself) of this great work treats of "The Literature of American Aboriginal Languages." Few could believe that a good octavo volume would be necessary to exhaust the subject, yet so it is; and yet the great importance of a catalogue of this sort may be easily imagined when we quote the following from the preface:—"Comparative Philology has begun to be established upon solid scientific foundations; and the recent endeavours to establish finally a uniform system of linguistic orthography will, when generally received, give a new and important impetus to that study, which must lead to most interesting results. In such a state of progress, new literary guides are constantly required; and one of them, embracing the aboriginal languages of our great Western Continent, is hereby offered to those who take an interest in American linguistics."—*Bent's Advertiser*.

Dr. Owen's Works—We are requested to state that the new edition of Dr. Owen's works, edited by Dr. Goold, is now the property of Messrs. T. and T. Clark; of Edinburgh.

Library of Bishop Blomfield.—The principle portion of the Classical and Theological Library of the late Bishop Blomfield was sold by auction by Messrs. Sotheby and Wilkinson in the course of last week. Nearly every volume bore marks of having been carefully perused, and many of them were enriched with manuscript emendations and notes, most of which deserved to be formed into an "Adversaria Critica," similar to that of Porson, so ably edited by Bishops Blomfield and Monk after his decease. Among the more curious or scarce articles contained in the catalogue we may point out the following:—Æschylus, cum Scholiis Gr. curâ Roborselli, 2 vols., scarce, and when Bishop Blomfield first entered the field as an editor of the poet, unknown to him, 3*l.* 11*s.*—Alciphronis Epistolæ, curâ Bergleri, with MS. notes, copied by Bishop Blomfield "a Porsoni Schedis," 1*l.* 6*s.*—Black's Palæoromaica, with a MS. note by Bishop Blomfield, stating that he "wrote a review of this strange book in the *British Critic*," 10*s.*—Burton's Discourses, printed in 1684, and recommended by Bishop Blomfield as "truly admirable," 15*s.*—Æschyli Prometheus, edente C. J. Blomfield, with the editor's MS. notes, 2*l.* 10*s.*—Articles of Visitation, printed between 1628 and 1690, 3*l.*—Articles agreed upon by Archbishops and Bishops, with various old Tracts on Church Government, etc., 4*l.* 14*s.*—Assemani Codex Liturgicus, 13*l.*—Bible, in Cranmer's Version, printed by N. Hyll in 1552, imperfect, 12*l.*—Cartwright's Replies to Whitgift, 3*l.* 5*s.*—Aristophanes, the first edition, printed by Aldus, 4*l.* 7*s.*—Assemani Bibliotheca Orientalis, 6*l.* 6*s.*—Baber's Fac-simile of the Alexandrian Septuagint, 6*l.* 10*s.*—Dawes' Miscellanea Critica, with MS. notes in the exquisite caligraphy of the famous Porson, 5*l.*—Fulke on Ecclesiastical Discipline, 3*l.* 6*s.*—Arsenii Scholia in Euripidem, 2*l.* 2*s.*—

Catalogue of the Library of the Rt. Hon. T. Grenville, 5*l.* 12*s.* 6*d.*—Ceillier, *Histoire des Auteurs Sacrés et Ecclésiastiques*, 8*l.* 15*s.*—A very curious collection of Church papers, including, among other occasional Services, the very rare Form of Thanksgiving after the Great Plague in 1666, 7*l.*—Edward the Sixth his Injunctions, 2*l.*—Clementis Alexandrini Opera, curante Potter, 4*l.* 12*s.*—Hickes' Records of the New Consecrations, 13*s.*—Ephraem Syri Opera, curâ Assemani, 10*l.* 17*s.* 6*d.*—Liturgia Anglicana, Latinè, printed by Vautrollier in 1574, 1*l.* 9*s.*—Forms of Prayer for 27th October, 1572; on the Earthquake, 1580, and for Queen Elizabeth's Preservation from Papists in 1586, in 1 vol., 1*l.* 15*s.*—Hesychii Lexicon, with MS. additions by Bishop Blomfield, 3*l.* 13*s.* 6*d.*—Eustathii Commentarii in Homerum, 7*l.*—Mather's Ecclesiastical History of New England, by a typographical error described as of New Zealand, 3*l.* 5*s.*—Sophocles, curâ Musgrave, with MS. notes by Bishop Blomfield, 7*l.*—Virgilius, curâ Stephani, from Queen Elizabeth's Library, and with the Autograph of the great Dr. Bentley, 1*l.* 11*s.*—Testamentum Novum Gerbelii, 2*l.* 6*s.*—Watts's Bibliotheca, 5*l.* 5*s.*—Wilkin's Concilia, 22*l.* 10*s.*

Professor Constantin Tischendorf, of the University of Leipzig, has undertaken another journey to the East, (at the expense, we understand, of the Russian Government), in order to explore the manuscript treasures hidden in the Greek Convents.

NEW WORKS PUBLISHED DURING THE LAST QUARTER.

In addition to those noticed in the body of the Journal.

FOREIGN.

Bargés (J. J. L., et Goldberg, D.B.)—R. Jehuda Ben Kareisch : *Epistola de Stadli Targum utilitate.* Paris.

Berling (A.)—Godsdienstige Gezangen voor Mannenstemmen, ten Dienste der Synagogen, bij Gelegenheid der Gewone Kerkgangen op Vrijdag-Avond en Zaterdag-Morgen, Gecomponeerd en den Wel-Edelen Heeren Leden der Hoofd-Commissie. (Religious Chants, for Voices of Men, for Synagogal Worship, in the Service on Friday Evenings and the Sabbath Mornings). Amsterdam.

Bianchi.—*Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique dans ses rapports, avec les souverainetés temporelles.* Traduit de l'Italien, par Peltier. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Colani (T.)—*Revue de Theologie et de Philosophie Chrétienne.* Paris. 8vo.

Damiron.—*Mémoires pour servir à l'Histoire de la Philosophie au dix-huitième siècle.* 2 Vols. 8vo.

Delitzsch.—*Commentar zum Brief an die Hebräer.* Mit archäologischen und dogmatischen Excursen über das Opfer und die Versöhnung. (Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews). 8vo.

Dorner (Dr. J. A.)—*Die Lehre von der Person Christi nach dem Reformationszeitalter bis zur Gegenwart.* (Doctrine of the Person of Christ from the Reformation to the present Day). Berlin. 8vo.

Flottes.—*Etude sur Daniel Huet, évêque d'Avranches.* 8vo.

Friedländer (Dr. C. A.)—*Scholæ Hebraicæ Minores.* Fasc. I. Berlin.

- Gluckhorn (Dr. A.)—Geschichte des Gottesfriedens. (History of the Truce of God). Leipsic. 8vo.
- Guettée.—Jansénisme et Jésuitisme, ou Examen des accusations de Jansénisme, soulevées par M. Lequeux, nouvel éditeur des Mémoires de Picot, et par "l'Ami de la Religion" contre M. l'Abbé Guettée, auteur de "Histoire de l'Eglise de France," etc. 8vo.
- Haller.—Briefe über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Offenbarung, mit einer einleitenden Charakteristik Haller's auf's Neue herausgegeben von Auberlen. (Letters on the most important truths of the Apocalypse). 8vo.
- Hiemer.—Die Einführung des Christenthums in den Deutschen Landen. (The Introduction of Christianity into Germany). Vol. I. 8vo.
- Jong (Petrus de.)—Disquisitio de Psalmis Maccabaicis. Leyden.
- Jacobi (Dr. J. L.)—Dr. A. Neander's Christliche Dogmengeschichte. 2 ter Theil. (Neander's History of Dogmas.) Berlin.
- Krabinger (F. G.)—Ambrosii de officiis Ministrorum, Libri III.; cum Paulini libello de vitâ Ambrosii. Tübingen.
- Laemmer Hugo.—St. Anselmi Cantuarensis libri duo "Cur Deus Homo?" Berlin. 12mo.
- Lieben.—Grabstein-schriften des Prager Israel: alten Friedhofs, mit bio-graphischen Notizen. (Inscriptions on Tombstones in the Old Cemetery of Prague). Prague. 8vo.
- Liebetrut (Dr. F.)—Die Evangelische Allianz und ihre Stellung zur Kirche, insonderheit zu der Evangelischen Kirche in Preussen. (The Evangelical Alliance and its Relation to the Church, especially to the Evangelical Church in Prussia). Berlin. 8vo.
- Macaire.—Introduction à la Théologie orthodoxe. Traduite par un Russe. 8vo.
- Matthias.—Das 3 Capitel des Briefes an die Römer übersetzt und ausgelegt. Ein exegetischer Versuch. (The third chapter of the Romans translated, etc.) 8vo.
- Monumenta Conciliorum Generalium Seculi XV. Ediderunt Cæsaræ Academiæ Scientiarum Socii delegati. Tom. I. Concilium Basileense. Vienna. Fol.
- Nenhæuser.—Cadmilus sive de Cabirom cultu ac mysteriis antiquissimæque Græcorum religionis ingenio atque origine. 8vo.
- Nickes (D. J. A.)—De Estheræ libro et ad eum quæ pertinent Vaticiniis et Psalmis. Pars prior. Romæ: typis S. C. de propagandâ Fide.
- Niebuhr (M. V.)—Geschichte Assur's und Babel's seit Phul aus der Concordanz des alten Testaments, des Berossos, des Kanons der Könige und der Griechischen Schriftsteller. (The History of Asshur and Babel from the time of Phul, etc.) 8vo.
- Oehler (F.)—S. Maximi Confessoris de variis difficilibus locis S. S. P. P. Dionysii et Gregorii ad Thomam V. S. librum. Ex codice manuscripto Gudiano descripsit et in Latinum sermonem interpretatus post J. Scoti et Th. Galei tentamina nunc primum integrum edidit. 8vo.
- Ridbeck.—Donatus und Augustinus oder der erste entscheidende Kampf zwischen Separatismus und Kirche. Ein kirchenhistorischer Versuch. (The first decisive conflict between Sectarianism and the Church). 8vo, first half.
- Schumacher.—Handbuch zur Erklärung der heiligen Geschichte des alten und neuen Testaments, (Handbook to the Sacred History of the Holy Scriptures). Vol. I. 8vo.
- Steir (G.)—Hebräisches Vocabularium zum Schulgebrauch (Hebrew Vocabulary for Schools.) Leipsic.
- Schöpff (F. G. P.)—Aurora: sive Bibliotheca selecta ex scriptis eorum qui ante Lutherum Ecclesiæ studuerunt restituendæ. Partes I.—III. Dresden. 8vo.
- Tischendorf.—Novum Testamentum Græce. Pt. IV. Leipsic.
- Vinet (A.)—Meditations Evangeliques. Paris. 12mo.

ENGLISH.

Bibliotheca Sacra, and *American Biblical Repository*. October, 1857.
Andover.

Christian Examiner, for November, 1857. Boston, U.S.

Clark (Rev. J.)—*Outlines of Theology; or, the General Principles of Revealed Religion briefly stated*. London: Ward and Co. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Clements (H. G. J., M.A.)—*Reminiscences of Pilgrimage to the Holy Places of Palestine*. London: Parkers. 12mo.

Cumming (Rev. J. G., M.A.)—*The Runic and other Monumental Remains of the Isle of Man*. London: Bell and Daldy. 1857. 4to.

Cyclopædia Bibliographica. (Subjects, Part III.) London: Darling.

Ellicott, (C. J., M.A.)—*A Critical and Grammatical Commentary on St. Paul's Epistles to the Philippians, Colossians, and to Philemon, with a revised Translation*. London: Parker and Son. 8vo.

Elmlicht (Twinrock, Esq.)—*Theophania: or, a scriptural View of the Manifestation of the Logos, or Pre-existent Messiah, as contradistinguished from angelic personation of the Deity, etc.* London: Richardson. 12mo.

Evangelicism (the Philosophy of), evolved from the relations between Conscience and the Atonement. London: Bell and Daldy. 12mo.

Goodwin (Rev. Harvey, M.A.)—*A Commentary on the Gospel of St. Matthew*, London: Bell and Daldy. 12mo.

Hardwick (Rev. Charles, M.A.)—*The Religions of China*. Cambridge: MacMillans. 8vo.

Hunt (Leavitt.)—*Agrippa; or, the Evangelists. Historical Point of View*. New York. 8vo.

James (Henry.)—*Christianity the Logic of Creation*. London: White. 12mo.

Murdock (Rev. James, D.D.)—*Biographical Sketch of*. New Haven.

Muston (Alexis, D.D.)—*The Israel of the Alps; a complete History of the Vaudois of Piedmont, and their Colonies, prepared in great part from unpublished documents. Translated by the Rev. J. Montgomery. With numerous illustrations*. London and Glasgow: Blackie. 2 Vols. 8vo.

Osburn (William.)—*The Religions of the World; being historical Sketches of Ancient and Modern Heathenism, Romanism, Mohammedism, and Christianity*. London: Seeleys. 12mo.

Raine (Rev. James, M.A.)—*A Memoir of the Rev. John Hodgson, M.A., Author of a History of Northumberland, etc.* London: Longmans. Vol. I.

Rogers (Professor H.)—*Selections from the Correspondence of R. E. H. Greysen, Esq.* London: Longmans. 2 Vols. 12mo.

Theism, the Philosophy of, an inquiry into the dependence of Theism on Metaphysics, and the only possible way of arriving at a proof of the Existence of God. London: Ward and Co. 12mo.

UNIV. OF MICH

NOV 23 1968

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06362 1554

UNIV. OF MICH

NOV 23 1968

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN



3 9015 06362 1554